The Communist

20c MARCH 1942

TOWARD LABOR UNITY
EDITORIAL

•

THE RIO DE JANEIRO CONFERENCE
WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

•

BROWDER WARNED AMERICA

•

AMERICA AND THE UNITED NATIONS
EUGENE DENNIS

•

THE FAR EASTERN FRONT IN THE WAR AGAINST THE AXIS
JAMES S. ALLEN

•

JOSEPH E. DAVIES' "MISSION TO MOSCOW" REVIEWED

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN A NEW POPULAR EDITION

Marxism and the National Question

By JOSEPH STALIN

This volume of writings and reports by Joseph Stalin on various aspects of the national question is indispensable for a correct understanding of the forces and objectives in the present war of liberation, which is being waged jointly by the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, China, and the peoples of the occupied countries against world-wide fascist enslavement. Buy, read, study and master this great classic of Marxism-Leninism.

NOW 85¢

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXI, No. 2 MARCH, 1942

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Toward Labor Unity	*Editorial*	99
America and the United Nations	*Eugene Dennis*	114
Browder Warned America		125
The Rio de Janeiro Conference	*William Z. Foster*	131
The Far Eastern Front in the War Against the Axis	*James S. Allen*	143
Let Freedom Ring for Earl Browder	*Carl Ross*	163
Production for Victory	*Bruce Minton*	171
Soviet-American Friendship: The Contribution of "Mission to Moscow"	*William Lindsay*	179

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To Our Subscribers

Due to circumstances over which the publishers had no control, the February issue of *The Communist* has been omitted. All subscriptions will, therefore, be extended by one issue.

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TOWARD LABOR UNITY

EDITORIAL

THE establishment of the Labor Victory Board composed of representatives of the two great labor organizations, the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., having between them over 10,000,000 organized workers, represents another milestone in the long and eventful history of the American labor movement. It is a step urgently demanded by the needs of the present war emergency. The collaboration of the President of the United States in the work of this board—a factor justified solely by the war emergency and the requisites of national unity — emphasizes its importance, not only to labor, but to the entire nation.

The formation of the Labor Victory Board likewise is a recognition of labor's vital role in our nation and especially in the national war effort. It provides for a greater voice and participation of labor in helping shape and influence governmental policies, especially for the furtherance of policies essential to victory over Nazi-fascist slavery. At the same time it makes possible and will promote united action by the whole labor movement. Similarly, it is a step in the direction of realizing the full unification of the trade union movement through organic unity.

* * *

The basis for achieving the gigantic advance in labor's unity of action on the political and economic fronts which the formation of this board and united labor committee heralds and facilitates, as well as the new and more favorable prospects arising for hastening the establishment of complete unity of the trade union movement, have been prepared by the developments in the labor movement during the past five years, as well as by the changes brought about as a result of the treacherous attacks of the Axis powers against our country.

For one thing, the present upsurge in the movement toward labor unity has been made possible by the big advances that the American working class has made in the past years toward overcoming the historic division that existed in its ranks while the vast majority of the workers in the basic and mass production industries were practically unorganized.

The very formation of the C.I.O. and the successes that it has achieved in bridging this split, in organizing the unorganized in the basic industries through the adoption of progressive policies and the industrial form of organization, also helped bring about important changes within the A. F. of L. Under the impact of the achievements of the C.I.O. and the progressive role

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which it played and exercises in the labor movement and in the political life of the nation, a majority of the A. F. of L. workers and a good section of their leadership were also prepared for the big step forward toward a united labor movement represented by the creation of the joint A. F. of L.-C.I.O. Labor Victory Board. Above all, the urgent tasks confronting the labor movement and the whole nation as a result of the just and progressive war in which our country is now engaged greatly accelerated this process toward labor and national unity.

Already in September, 1939, immediately after part of the world became engulfed in war and just prior to the time when A. F. of L.-C.I.O. "unity negotiations" came to a halt, the great and farsighted leader of our party, Comrade Browder, observed this process toward the unification of the trade union movement and counseled:

"We declare that unity of labor, unity of the working class, unity of the trade union movement, must be the backbone of any really effective unity of the people. Workers of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O., *who agree in the great majority on all the most crucial issues of the day, must find the way to act together as they already think together,* to defeat all enemies of unity, and make labor a great power in the life of our country, above all, in these days of danger and emergency."* (Emphasis ours.)

But this process of unity of action did not then lead to the unification of the labor movement. Partly because of this continued division, and partly as a result of other causes, the labor movement went through a period of unclarity and confusion on a number of the most important issues before the country, especially as regards foreign policy. This also in turn affected the progress toward labor unity and war.

But after June 22, when the unprovoked aggression of Hitler Germany against the Soviet Union shocked the American working class and the people as a whole, and made clear that Hitlerism was determined upon a course of world domination and threatened the very existence and independence of the United States, the movement for working class unity received a tremendous impetus and resulted in greater unity of action between the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. workers. This collaboration took the form of joint actions and working agreements between local unions, central bodies, state organizations and even among national unions of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. Even where collaboration did not take the form of united action it was generally expressed in common policies and parallel actions.

In October and November, 1941, the two national conventions of the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. gave expression to this trend and orientation. Both labor bodies unanimously endorsed the Government foreign policy, supported a program of aid to the Soviet Union, Britain and China, and adopted other measures identical in their essentials for the mobilization of labor for the war

* Earl Browder, *The Second Imperialist War*, International Publishers, p. 112.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effort, for the winning of the battle for production, for the protection of labor's rights and interests. The actions of these two conventions were at the same time a decisive repudiation of both Lewis and Hutcheson, who in each of the two organizations were the spokesmen of the isolationist and pro-fascist appeasement forces of the country, both being identified with the America First Committee.

An important factor, making for greater unity of labor, was the effort of some of the reactionary forces in the country to use the national emergency for the purpose of weakening the labor movement through reactionary legislation. The passage of the infamous Smith Bill by the lower House of Congress made both wings of the labor movement realize the necessity for closer collaboration and common action, for the purpose of guaranteeing that labor would be able to continue to serve and contribute most effectively in the national defense effort, and at the same time protect labor's hard-won gains and rights.

This growing movement for the unity of labor became irresistible after the treacherous attack by the Axis powers on Pearl Harbor on the fateful day of December 7. Leaders of parallel unions in the same industry, leaders of respective city central bodies and state federations threw aside differences and prejudices and increasingly merged their common efforts in the great war emergency that confronted our country. The sentiment for unity among the workers of both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. was so strong that when President Roosevelt called together the labor-industry-government conference which resulted in the setting up of the new War Labor Board, it was an easy matter for the spokesmen of the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. to agree on joint proposals and present a common front at the conference. This conference agreed on measures to speed up and guarantee the maximum production in the war industries, to prevent stoppages of work through strikes or lockouts, and provided that all disputes of "rival" organizations of labor should be submitted to "available government machinery for peaceful settlement and disposition."

This agreement for the settling of jurisdictional disputes, the common front of labor at the labor-industry-government conference, together with the growing united action of labor throughout the country on a wide range of issues essential for strengthening the national war effort and for protecting the vital interests of labor, was preparing the ground for even closer collaboration between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. on a national scale, as well as for promoting the organic unification of the trade union movement.

* * *

It was into this situation that the letter of Lewis burst like a bombshell upon the labor movement and the country. The very form in which it was made, over the heads of, and without any previous consultation with, President Murray and the other duly elected officers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the C.I.O., could not but inevitably create suspicion as to Lewis' motive.

The widespread rumors, never denied, that Lewis had been meeting with Hutcheson and some other A. F. of L. leaders also tended to give support to the belief that this Lewis maneuver, among other things, was directed against the leadership of the C.I.O. and also against President Green and some of his associates in the leadership of the A. F. of L. This fact would remain even if one could attribute to Lewis no other motive than the obvious one of trying to use the popular issue of unity for the purpose of trying to recoup his lost influence in the labor movement and among the American people which developed as a result of his isolationist and appeasement policies and his association with the pro-fascist America First Committee. But when it is remembered that Lewis, like his confreres of the America First Committee, has not to date repudiated his position on the war and that he has not dissociated himself from his America First colleagues, then his "unity" maneuver takes on a much more sinister aspect than might appear on the surface. And President Murray made a very apt comparison when he stated in his first reaction to the Lewis move that the labor movement would not allow itself to be "Pearl Harbored."

But no matter how "clever" Lewis may have thought his maneuver to be, he soon found that the labor movement is far too advanced to be trapped, and that the workers are determined not to be diverted from the immediate tasks for winning the war and from the path leading in the direction of organic unity of the trade union movement.

The C.I.O., under the leadership of President Philip Murray, met the issue squarely, and its action is now being hailed by the whole labor movement. In its statement of policy the C.I.O. declared:

"Labor unity among the workers of the nation within a powerful labor movement espousing these basic progressive and humanitarian principles has always been one of the aspirations of the C.I.O.

"The C.I.O. desires a unified labor movement which will reflect the aspirations and needs of the American workers. This would necessarily require a recognition of the industrial form of organization in the mass production industries and the *absolute need of non-discrimination against any affiliated union or any member of the C.I.O.* (Emphasis ours.)

"A permanent solution of this question presents numerous difficulties. The adjustment of this problem must not be permitted to weaken or destroy the existing and developing united action of labor—both nationally and locally—in the prosecution of the national war effort."

In this forthright and realistic position the C.I.O. leadership reiterated its adherence to the principle of organic unity of the trade union movement and made clear that such unity must be in the interests of the entire labor movement, and that it can have nothing in common with any proposals aim-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to divide the workers in the name of "unity." It pledged itself to work for organic unity. But at the same time it declared that while this problem is being worked out, none of the obstacles still to be overcome before organic unity is achieved must be allowed to stand in the way of that unity and common action which is already being achieved and which can and must be expanded in the interests of the national war effort.

It is to the credit of the A. F. of L. leadership that it rejected the Lewis maneuver in which some of their number, like William Hutcheson, were evidently involved, and that it accepted the proposal put forth by President Roosevelt for the creation of the Labor Victory Board. This action by the A. F. of L. will go a long way in creating further mutual confidence and closer ties between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L.

* * *

The vital role that labor is now playing in the economic and political life of the country, especially now when we are engaged in mortal combat against the world forces of fascist slavery, a struggle in which all patriotic Americans of all clases are engaged, carries with it great responsibilities. The labor movement has the task of working in such a way and in collaborataing with the other classes engaged in the national war effort so that national unity will be strengthened, so that labor's role and contributions in the common war effort will be enhanced. The majority of the American people are becoming convinced that a powerful and united labor movement is essential to victory in the war.

But the pro-fascist appeasement elements of the bourgeoisie, their hangers-on and apologists, are opposed to a strong and united trade union movement, because they are opposed to and want to disrupt national unity; they want to block the destruction of Hitler and Hitlerism. They know that the working class is the mortal enemy of fascism and reaction. They know that a strong and united labor movement will strengthen national unity and the prosecution of the war, and therefore that labor unity is a menace to all those who wish to destroy everything that is progressive and democratic in the life, history, tradition and culture of the United States. To all these enemies of our country, labor unity is a bulwark against their sinister plans to establish a reactionary fascist regime in the United States, a regime which, by the very nature of the present situation, could only be on a model of Vichy in its relations to the masses at home and to the Hitler objective of dominating the world.

Unfortunately it cannot be denied that even among those sections of the bourgeoisie who support the war policy of the Government there are certain influential groups, who because of their "business as usual" mentality, because of narrow class interests, have also adopted a position toward organized labor which is dangerous and harmful for the nation. These selfish groups oppose labor's greater participation in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war effort. They try to hinder the growth of the trade union movement and argue that it is necessary for labor to sacrifice its fundamental rights in the interests of national unity. They sponsor and applaud anti-labor legislation like the Smith Bill, and the attacks of Congressman Dies on the labor movement, which have the object of dividing and weakening the labor movement, thereby damaging national unity and an all-out struggle for victory.

A very profound reply to these elements, an answer that should be considered most thoughtfully by all Americans, was given by the Acting Secretary of our party, Comrade Minor, in his report to a recent meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., when he said:

"Those who are now arguing for a limitation of the role of the trade unions in industry, advocating the breaking down of the trade unions, on the ground that this weakening of the unions is a sacrifice necessary for the national defense, are offering a program of disaster to the nation and not just to labor; because under modern conditions and particularly the conditions of this war there can be no successful defense of the national existence and independence of the nation without a powerful organized labor movement as a decisive factor, not only in industry, but politically, in the national front."

In fact, it was the growth of the trade union movement in the past decade, and the growing political maturity of the American working class, that made it impossible for the pro-fascist appeasement forces in the United States to impose their policies on the nation, and that contributed greatly to the preparation of our country to occupy its present historic and honorable role in the world anti-Hitler front, which is headed jointly by the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain. And it is precisely the continued growth, role and activity of the labor movement, organizationally and politically, which provide a major guarantee that our country will defeat every element of capitulation and treason, will smash every effort of the fascist and appeasement forces to sabotage the war effort, and together with the United Nations America will help crush fascism and annihilate the Axis powers.

Those who have not mastered the laws of the motion of society, who do not understand class and social relations, could indeed be surprised by the unanimity with which the C.I.O. repulsed this latest attack on its unity and the unity of the whole labor movement. Especially is this so since this attack came in the subtle form of a "unity" proposal and from one who it must be admitted contributed no little to the building of the C.I.O. The fact that the A. F. of L. leadership also rejected the Lewis proposals, even though a few of its leaders were also involved with Lewis, only emphasizes the basic changes which have taken place in the ranks of labor. The key to an understanding of what was and is happening is to be found in the report of the veteran

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor leader and Chairman of our party, Comrade Foster, to the recent meeting of our party's National Committee in which he said:

"Let me say finally, that the American trade union movement, both big sections of it, the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., is on the march forward. It is strengthening its numbers, unifying its forces, clarifying its understanding, improving its leadership. . . . Nor can all the reactionaries with their Smith Bill, their Dies Committees, and their organized sabotage of national defense—halt the progress of the American labor movement and the development of the American people's struggle against Hitlerism."

This is why even Lewis, who formerly made contributions to the building of the C.I.O., could not halt its progress. So long as Lewis was moving in the direction of the progress of the labor movement, he could enjoy authority in its councils and great popularity among the masses. But as soon as he began to march in the opposite direction, the labor movement would not follow him. This attests further to the fact that the growth of the labor movement has not been only in numbers. Together with the growth in numbers and partly as a very consequence of this the labor movement qualitatively has reached a higher stage of political clarity, understanding and consciousness.

* * *

In order to understand more fully the character of this *new* labor movement, in order to know the general direction of its further development, it is necessary to study and understand the basic forces which helped bring it about. Here we can only indicate some of these factors.

In former years, the American labor movement was, in the main, restricted to a small section of the working class, primarily the skilled craftsmen. Despite the many militant struggles that fill the pages of the history of our labor movement, the great mass of the semi-skilled and unskilled workers in the basic and mass production industries remained unorganized. This division within the labor movement, the existence of a small privileged section of the working class—the labor aristocracy—was a reflection of and resulted from the existence and policies of imperialism (monopoly capital) which, because of its favored position in the world market and the super-profits from colonial exploitation and monopoly positions, was able to bribe a small section of the working class and to foster social reformism and disunity in the ranks of the working class. This phenomenon was not exclusive to the United States, although there were also factors exclusive to the United States that helped foster and prolong the division in the American working class, as well as retarded the movement for independent labor political action and the liberation of the working class from the influence of the bourgeoisie and its parties.

But already in the early part of the present century no capitalist country could occupy the exclusive position in the world market that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain did for more than half a century earlier, even though each of them had some degree of monopoly.

Lenin in his great work *Imperialism,* written in 1916, observed this process, which had already been going on for some time. He stated, in part:

"The distinctive feature of the present situation is the prevalence of economic and political conditions which could not but increase the irreconcilability between opportunism and the general and vital interests of the working class movement. Embryonic imperialism has grown into a dominant system; capitalist monopolies occupy first place in economy and politics; the division of the world has been completed. On the other hand, instead of an undisputed monopoly by Great Britain, we see a few imperialist powers disputing among themselves for the right to share in this monopoly, and this struggle is characteristic of the whole period of the beginning of the twentieth century. Opportunism, therefore, cannot now triumph in the working class movement of any country for decades as it did in England in the second half of the nineteenth century. . . ." *

Under these new conditions the basis for the rise of a strong, united and militant labor movement in our country was becoming ripe. But it could not be achieved spontaneously without a struggle against opportunism in the labor movement, especially against the policies of social-reformism and class collaboration. The Marxist and progressive forces in the A. F. of L., in the old Socialist Party and in the I.W.W., carried on this struggle, for the organization of the unorganized, for the unity of labor and for a militant and independent working class policy. And if this struggle did not culminate at that time in the organization of the workers in the mass production industries, in the formation of a mass Labor party, in the establishment of labor unity, etc., this is due to many factors. Among these must be included the tendency for illusions among the workers to persist for a time even after their material basis no longer exists, also because most of the Marxist and progressive forces in their struggle against the opportunist policies and organizational methods of the Gomperses and Hillquits, were themselves guilty of gross Leftist-sectarian mistakes which also hindered the organization, unity and political development of the labor movement and the working class as a class. (And it is surely no mere accident that even before the organization of the Communist Party of the United States, Comrades Foster and Browder should have been identified with and participated in the leadership of movements to organize the workers around policies and organizational forms, that were in opposition to both the opportunists and the sectarians.)

It is not possible here to examine the history of that whole period, nor the period from the end of the First World War until the formation of the C.I.O., to trace all the interven-

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works,* International Publishers, Vol. V, p. 99.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing changes in the position and role of American and world capitalism during and following the First World War, to analyze the influence of the victory and building of socialism in the U.S.S.R. upon the working class, or to review the important developments which occurred in the American labor movement. But it should be noted in this connection, if only in passing, that the rise of the Communist Party, the growth of the Left wing movement within the trade unions after the First World War, were among those vital factors that influenced large sections of the labor movement to break with the opportunist policies and organizational methods of the Gomperses and Hillquits and contributed to the developing consciousness and strength of the working class which enabled it to take the historic steps it did in the 'thirties and subsequently.

Furthermore, the great economic crisis of 1929-33 brought about a "revolution" in the thoughts of the American workers. Lessons that had been maturing for a long time, and which the Communists and the Left-wing forces in the trade unions had been able to teach to only a small section of the working class, were brought home to the tens of millions in the only way in which the millions learn—by experience. Above all, the workers learned the need for organization to protect their economic and political interests. They learned that only through mass economic and political struggles can they defend their interests. And while they had not then, and have not yet even today, fully learned how most effectively to act independently as a class, they did nonetheless make great strides in this direction.

A significant expression of the new mood of the workers and of the maturing conditions for the *new* labor movement which accompanied the rise of the economic struggles of large sections of the employed and unemployed workers, came in the 1932 elections, when the reactionary Republican Hoover Administration was decisively defeated and Franklin D. Roosevelt was swept into office on the promise of a "New Deal." To those who are often confused by this, it must be repeated that it was not Roosevelt that brought about the changed mood of the masses, but rather this mood of the masses that brought Roosevelt into office and consequently exerted a great influence on the policies of the Roosevelt Administration.

The rise of Hitler to power in 1933, the destruction of the labor movement that followed in Germany, the emergence of the anti-fascist People's Front movement in France, Spain and other countries, the successes and the growing influence of the Soviet Union, the attacks of the pro-fascist and reactionary forces against even the mild liberal reforms introduced by the Roosevelt Administration — all helped to accelerate the process of the organization and growing independent political activity of labor and other sections of the working people. The workers more and more realized that they needed a strong labor movement, a militant working class policy and unity of action

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to protect themselves, the American people and the nation from the forces of fascism and reaction at home and abroad that were threatening the free trade union movement, our democratic institutions and our national interests.

The growth of the labor movement, uniting workers of various degree of skill, also wiped out to a considerable extent the division that existed on the basis of race, sex, and age which was fostered by the bourgeoisie and the old labor bureaucracy. Negro workers, women workers, and youth labor, as well as large sections of foreign born who constitute a considerable portion of the workers in the mass production industries, are today united in the various industrial unions of the C.I.O. and also in quite a number of A. F. of L. unions. This greater homogeneity, unity, organization and political activity of the working class has made the trade union movement more conscious of and sensitive to all problems facing the whole people and nation, and has made labor the indispensable force, the backbone of the unity of the nation. To the extent that labor continues to develop its political and organizing initiative, mobilizes everything for winning the war, and organizes common action in its own ranks and with all other sections of the people for this purpose—it is making the greatest contribution to national unity and the national war effort.

It must be clear to all honest thinking people that the fact that the American working class is today ready and prepared, is taking its place in the front ranks of the struggle for the freedom and independence of our country against the threat of Nazi-Axis slavery, that this is due to no small extent to the fact that the workers were prepared for this by the struggles to build their labor movement, to defend and advance the vital interests of labor and the people. For, in so doing, organized labor has learned, among other things, the urgent need to unite its own ranks, to play a more independent role, and devotedly and uncompromisingly to fulfill its responsibilities to the nation and people, and thereby to the working class itself.

* * *

The creation of the Labor Victory Board and the important role it should exercise, places a great responsibility upon every trade union organization and upon every trade unionist. The success of the national war effort and the cause of labor unity depends to no small extent on how effectively and how quickly this responsibility is met.

For one thing, it is essential that the significance and activities of the Labor Victory Board, and the proposals of both the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. as to future policies should be fully and democratically discussed by all of the local organizations, the central bodies and the national affiliates of the two labor bodies. It is especially necessary that united actions be extended on a local and state scale, as well as nationally, and that the joint C.I.O.-A. F. of L. committees that have already been

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

set up be continued and strengthened. It is necessary that the developing unity of action between the two labor organizations be reinforced and expanded everywhere, for speeding up war production in every plant and industry, for helping strengthen civilian defense and the armed might of the nation, as well as for working out united legislative and electoral activity that will advance the movement for labor and national unity, and on this basis strengthen labor's activities, political influence and positions. Only in this way will the movement for labor unity make the necessary progress and will the Labor Victory Board be able effectively to fulfill its responsibilities and realize its great potentialities. Common action around a common program and policies by labor's members on the board, and by the joint actions of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. national, state and local organizations, will inevitably lead to even greater unity of action within the labor movement and to a gigantic strengthening of national unity of all patriots, from all groups and classes, around the government in furtherance of the national war effort.

The recent pronouncements and actions of the A. F. of L. Council, especially as they relate to the government's war policy, and the recent decisions of various A. F. of L. national and local organizations in this respect, would indicate substantial agreement on policy when compared with the following proposals adopted by the recent C.I.O. National Executive Board for the guidance of the C.I.O. representatives on the Labor Victory Board:

"First it is crucial that every step possible be taken for the increase in production. . . .

"Second, in the prosecuting of the war it is of the utmost importance that the morale of the American workers be maintained and constantly improved. . . . The living standards of the workers must be protected. The continued existence and growth of the labor movement must be guaranteed. This can be accomplished through the establishment of union security.

"A proper tax program apportioning the burdens of the cost of government among the people on an equitable basis is essential . . . steps . . . to control and prevent the spiraling of the cost of living . . . measures to broaden social security. The impact of present unemployment resulting from conversion of plants . . . must be cushioned . . . Organized labor must establish its rightful place in the councils of the nation and secure the representation in Government to which it is entitled."

These proposals, which are supplementary to the well established policies of both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. and their loyal and energetic activities in supporting and implementing the war policy of the government and the nation, will undoubtedly be supported by the A. F. of L., by the Railway Brotherhoods, as well as by all of the American people.

The spirit and tempo in which the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., will cooperate nationally and locally will develop and consolidate their united

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

activity in the factories, on the legislative front, in the coming Congressional elections, etc., will determine the extent to which this program will become the common program of the whole labor movement. And the manner in which the whole labor movement will take up more actively and unitedly its growing responsibilities in the war effort will determine the wider measure of support that labor will be able to rally among all strata of the people for its program and proposals which are in the national interests, which are urgently needed in order to augment and strengthen the victorious prosecution of the war against the Berlin - Tokio - Rome Axis.

The government likewise is faced with great responsibilities in this connection. It is called upon to give more serious consideration to labor's initiative and proposals. It should, without further delay draw labor more actively and fully into participation in the war agencies and into the government itself, to give labor adequate representation in the cabinet. It should resolutely insist that the employers fully live up to their responsibilities to labor and the nation and stop trying to take advantage of the war for the purpose of weakening the labor movement or of trying to limit labor's role in the formulation and execution of the national war policy. Doing this will strengthen national unity, the government and the defense of our country.

Just as organized labor has become more conscious of and responsive to the vital need of establishing the maximum unity of action within the country it is also to be hoped that both sections of the labor movement will soon recognize the burning necessity for speedily advancing international trade union unity of action, in the interests of all the anti-Hitler peoples, for strengthening the war effort of our country and the United Nations against Nazi-fascist slavery. Many American trade unionists have greeted the establishment of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee as a necessary counterpart of the growing world front of anti-Axis nations and peoples. But as yet no substantial movement has been developed actively to collaborate with or to affiliate the American trade union movement to this committee. Such a step on the part of our trade union movement which would help coordinate and unify the anti-Axis policies and struggles of the trade union movements of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Britain — the three most powerful countries of the world which are fighting as allies in a common cause, would strengthen immeasurably the world anti-Hitler coalition and struggle against Hitlerism. It is likewise necessary for the trade union movement of our country to establish the closest working relations with the trade union movements of our sister republics to the South, as well as with the labor movements of China and the other Far Eastern countries. This too is in accord with the common interests of our peoples and will help reinforce the historic Declaration into a full-fledged mili-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tary and political alliance between the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the other twenty-two anti-Axis nations.

* * *

The Communists, who like all loyal Americans are giving their best to the national war effort for the destruction of Hitler and the fascist Axis, who are devotedly serving in the armed forces, in the mines, mills and factories, in their communities—and whose principles and practices make them the strongest and most determined fighters for the unity of the labor movement, greet the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. leadership, who by their spirit of patriotism and labor solidarity have promoted labor and national unity and have thereby strengthened the defense of our country. Every Communist will do all in his power to help realize the aims and tasks which gave birth to and now confront the Labor Victory Board.

The Communists, who believe that greater labor unity of action as well as the organic unity of the trade union movement can be achieved in the present situation, do not look upon the Labor Victory Board either as a contradiction to this objective or a substitute for it. They see in it an important step in the direction of promoting the common action and eventually the organic unity of the trade union movement.

Various enemies of labor and of labor unity, Red-baiters in and out of the labor movement, those who in this hour of peril would promote disunity of our people and of labor, are now spreading lies to the effect that the Communists opposed the complete unification of the trade union movement. By such slanders these people, like the editors of the *New Leader*, expose their true aims as seeking not the unity of the trade union movement, but its further division. They cannot conceive of the unity of the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. without the disruption and breaking up of some of the most important and progressive unions of the C.I.O. and without scuttling those progressive principles and policies upon which the C.I.O. was founded and developed. But these people, who look backward instead of forward, who have always opposed the organization, unity and independent activity of labor, will be left behind in the present stage of history as they have been left behind before. They will not and cannot succeed in holding back the progress of the labor movement.

The Communists never did and never will stand in the way of any forward step of and by the labor movement. The Communists never look upon any policy of labor and the people with narrow "partisan" eyes. Our whole understanding, all of our policies and practices, are based on the principle that the Communists have no interests separate and apart from the working class and the American people; and conversely, that which benefits and advances the interests of labor and the people is in the common interests of all workers, Communist and non-Communist, and of the national interests of our country as well.

In this connection, it is useful to emphasize again that when the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communists expose and combat the red-baiters, they are defending, not merely the rights of the Communists, but the rights of the whole labor movement and the democratic rights of all the people. Those who would deny the Communists their rights, those who tolerate attacks on the Communists in and out of the labor movement, are jeopardizing the rights and liberties of the whole labor movement, of all the people. This truth has been demonstrated in life, time and again. Every honest person can now see that red-baiting has been one of the principal weapons through which Hitlerism deprived the people of Germany of their rights, reduced them to slavery, and which it subsequently used to help divide and conquer nation after nation. It is this weapon which Messrs. Dies and Coughlin, Norman Thomas and Waldman, Hoover and Lindbergh, and all pro-fascist appeasers continue to employ as one of their principal instruments for attempting to divide labor and the nation, for obstructing the war effort and for campaigning for a "negotiated peace" of surrender and capitulation to Hitler and the Axis.

The labor movement of the United States, both wings of it, the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L., are today learning this lesson. This is evidenced by the recent conventions of many state federations of the A. F. of L., by the policies of many central bodies of the A. F. of L., as it is by most of the unions affiliated to the C.I.O. In this respect Comrade Hudson's observation on the last national C.I.O. convention can be cited, as reflecting a growing understanding of the danger of red-baiting to the trade unions themselves:

"A further indication of the greater maturity of the labor movement and the great advances made since the last convention of the C.I.O. lay in the fact that the convention refused to split its unity into Right and Left, and refused to engage in fratricide through the old familiar game of red-baiting. Evidently this signifies that most forces in the C.I.O. have learned that to attempt to lump Communists with fascists is to fall victim to a historic lie that can only break labor's own ranks, weaken the trade union movement and thereby make a break in the united defense of the nation."*

And no honest and sincere trade unionists whether in the A. F. of L. or the C.I.O. can take exception to the statement of policy recently adopted by the National Executive Board of the C.I.O. as the guiding principle for the unity of the trade union movement, which declares that it must be based upon: "absolute non-discrimination against any affiliated union or member of the C.I.O."

The Communists in the C.I.O. and in the A. F. of L.—as loyal trade unionists, steadfastly working to build and strengthen the trade union movement, to advance and weld labor and national unity, to promote resolutely and energetically the national war effort, now and in the future, as in the past,

* Roy Hudson, *The C.I.O. Convention and National Unity*, Workers Library Publishers, p. 9.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by their tireless activity, initiative, self sacrifice and discipline more than ever will prove to their unions, to all the workers and to the nation, that to be known as a Communist is to be known as one who is most devoted to the welfare and cause of the labor movement and to the national interests of our country.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

BY EUGENE DENNIS

THE United States has a great role to perform in the crucial task of further strengthening the world front of peoples and nations against Hitler and Hitlerism. This is one of the most important urgent war tasks confronting our country.

For our nation, which already is a leading participant in the growing world front against Hitler and his allies, will win its just war of national freedom and democratic liberties only in the closest collaboration and alliance with the Soviet Union and Great Britain as the joint leaders of the United Nations.

It was. therefore, highly gratifying to find in the President's message to Congress in January a distinct recognition of the basic importance of this task. It was especially significant that the President also reported that the "consolidation of the United Nations' total war effort against our common enemies is being achieved," and:

"That is the purpose of conferences which have been held during the past two weeks in Washington, in Moscow and in Chungking. That is the primary objective of the declaration of solidarity signed in Washington on January 1, 1942, by nations united against the Axis powers."

As a result of these conferences, the following developments have been accelerated: the world anti-Axis front is growing; the collaboration between the three leading powers in this world front—the coalition of the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain—is becoming closer; a common world strategy is being crystallized, even though slowly, resting on the recognition that Hitler Germany is the main enemy requiring the main concentration of the war effort of the United Nations.

More specifically, these developments have thus far produced the following concrete arrangements for united action: United commands have been established for the southwestern Pacific and for the Chinese theater of war, with the latter assuming increasingly greater importance. A new step forward has been taken toward closer collaboration between the Soviet Union and Great Britain at the recent Moscow conference, as well as in respect to Iran, and between the United States and Great Britain at the recent Washington conference.

Then came the historic Declaration of anti-Axis solidarity of the United Nations. This was followed by the Pan-American Conference in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rio de Janeiro, which revealed, in the main, a high degree of anti-Axis solidarity among the nations of the Americas, isolating Hitler and his allies still further in the Western Hemisphere. And more recently there is the "combined chiefs of staff group" established by the United States and Great Britain in Washington "to insure complete coordination of the war effort of these two nations" and ". . . to provide for full British and American collaboration with the United Nations now associated in prosecution of the war against the Axis powers. . . ."

The United States and her Allies are drawing still closer together, extending their fields of cooperation and mutual action against the common enemy. The world isolation of Nazi Germany and its Axis partners is being completed. The task of further unifying and consolidating the war efforts of the United Nations "is being achieved," as the President said. *But a good deal still has to be done for the realization of this fundamental task.* The whole course of the war proves this, including the present temporary reverses of the anti-Axis nations in the Far East.

Fortunately, the recognition is growing among the decisive forces in the United Nations that this is indeed a primary task. It is the recognition that the further unity and complete collaboration of the United Nations will be achieved, enabling them jointly to muster their full strength for victory in the single and indivisible war against Hitler and the Axis, *only under the united leadership* of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain.

Everything that makes closer the coalition of these three powers promotes further the consolidation of the United Nations and ensures their eventual and common victory. Contrariwise, everything that interferes with the growing unity of this coalition obstructs the war effort and unity of purpose of the United Nations and postpones the day of final victory. It must, therefore, clearly be said that *the key* to the further consolidation of the United Nations, to securing the maximum coordination and strengthening of their war efforts, which is a major objective of our country, lies in the closest unity and united leadership between the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain.

However, it must be recognized that there are certain influences within the anti-Hitler camp in the United States, as well as in Great Britain, that do not agree or do not quite realize that the *united leadership* of the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain is the key to victory. In our own country there is to be found an inclination in some quarters to speak of Anglo-American unity and collaboration, not as a policy of consolidating the United Nations as a whole, and of making closer the existing collaboration, friendship and joint leadership of America, the U.S.S.R. and Britain, but as something quite distinct and different. In fact, the proposition of Anglo-American collaboration and partnership is sometimes presented, for instance by such

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an outspoken opponent of the Axis as the *New York Times*, in such a way as though it were intended to prevent the growing unity of the three leading powers of the United Nations.

Obviously these are harmful tendencies, inimical to the national interests of our country, which are encouraged and utilized by the pro-fascist appeasers. Whatever their motivation, such tendencies objectively work against the consolidation of the United Nations, since this consolidation cannot grow to victory without the closest united leadership of America, the Soviet Union and England; and since, furthermore, only in such united leadership can Anglo-American collaboration find its full and most effective expression. And this is true also of the collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union, as well as between Great Britain and the Soviet Union.

The tendency to underestimate the crucial importance of this three-power coalition—the U.S.A., U.S.S.R. and Great Britain—for reinforcing and consolidating the United Nations, likewise finds its expression in another form. This is the inclination to rely chiefly on various regional agreements and collaborations for separate parts of the world front—the southwest Pacific, China, the Atlantic, Europe, etc.

Clearly such regional collaborations are necessary for the United States and should be further developed, *not as a substitute* for further consolidating the political relations and joint war efforts of the United Nations and the leading coalition of the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain, *but as a means toward this end.* For only through this coalition, working in firm alliance, will our regional collaborations and united commands find their full and most effective expression, namely, in the united and most vigorous prosecution of the war to the end, for the total destruction of Hitler Germany and the fascist Axis.

It is a well known fact that the thing Hitler, the Mikado and Mussolini fear most is precisely the coalition of America, the Soviet Union and England. There is nothing they would wish for more than to drive a wedge into this coalition or to retard its further development. And they are still trying very hard to establish just that—they and the pro-fascist appeasers in our own midst. It was, therefore, very timely and proper for President Roosevelt to warn our people against these divisive tricks of the Hitlerites. Said the President:

"Hitler will try again to breed mistrust and suspicion between one individual and another, one group and another, one race and another, one government and another. He will try to use the same technique of falsehood and rumormongering with which he divided France from Britain. He is trying to do this with us even now. But he will find a unity of will and purpose against him which will persevere until the destruction of all his black designs upon freedom and safety of the people of the world." (*Ibid.*)

What is needed, therefore, is to give *further* concrete and practical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expression to this "unity of will and purpose" among the United Nations and their leading coalition. *This means that the coalition should be immediately reinforced with a full and all-around alliance between the three leading powers of the United Nations*—an alliance resting on complete and closest collaboration in the military, economic and political fields.

The establishment of such an alliance would speedily result in a greater coordination and gigantic strengthening of the military actions and power of the United Nations, would immeasurably accelerate the military defeat and destruction of Hitlerite Germany and of *Japanese and Italian imperialism.* It would lead to the adoption of measures that would make completely impossible the repetition of Nazi Axis aggression in the future. Moreover, the realization of such an alliance would make fully possible the elaboration of, agreement and collaboration on practical measures for organizing the peace and security of the world that will follow the victory of the United Nations.

Unquestionably the American people and government and their Allies are moving in this direction, though still too slowly. The conferences in Moscow between Stalin and Eden marked an important step forward to closer collaboration between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. The Roosevelt-Churchill conferences in Washington have resulted in closer collaboration between the United States and Great Britain. Both conferences have thereby strengthened the world anti-Axis coalition. Both are forward steps of tremendous importance for the further consolidation of the United Nations and for the development of an all-around alliance of the leading coalition of the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain. But it has to be recognized that the United Nations have to be further consolidated and that the leading coalition has to be developed into a full-fledged alliance. Our country and its Allies, all the people, need this to win the war and to win the peace.

Upon leaving Moscow, Sir Stafford Cripps, recently British Ambassador to the Soviet Union, said the following on the course of Anglo-Soviet relations:

"The alliance between our two great countries must be still further fortified and strengthened so as to enable us jointly to fulfill the task we have so auspiciously begun. We must give the fascists no respite nor time to regroup their armies nor the possibility of striking a blow in any new theater of war. They have lost the initiative and we must prevent them from ever regaining it . . . together we must move toward this victory. Together we must work and draw up plans for building that happier life which mankind has merited by its suffering and patience."

Later, in a signed article which appeared in the *New York Times* on February 7, 1942, Sir Stafford also stated:

"I am confident—and I know this from the highest authority—the Soviet Union is anxious and most

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

willing to work in association with Great Britain and America after the war, and to prepare now so as to make that work as effective and valuable as possible.

"To win the war is vital and for that purpose we must give every material aid to Russia. To win the peace is no less vital and to that end we must achieve full political co-operation among the three great allies of the war."

This is the course of development which the British people want to see in the relations between their country and the Soviet Union. This is the course of development which the American people are increasingly calling for in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. And judging from recent events alone, such as the Soviet communiqué on the Stalin-Eden conference, the Soviet-Polish pact, the Declaration of the United Nations and the joint Soviet-Iran-British agreement, as well as from the established policy of the U.S.S.R.—this likewise is the orientation and course of development which the Soviet Union is endeavoring resolutely to facilitate and promote. For this is in accord with its general effort and indefatigable activity to consolidate further the United Nations and the coalition of the United States, Great Britain and the U.S.S.R., to liberate the occupied territories of the Soviet Union from the German fascist yoke, to rout, annihilate and crush the military might of the German invaders, to support firmly China's struggle for national liberation, and to assist the peoples of Europe in their liberation struggle against Hitler tyranny and then "setting them free to rule on their own land as they desire." (Stalin: *Report to the Session of the Moscow Soviet,* November 6, 1941.)

Together we shall move to victory. Together we shall establish the peace. Together—this means the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain, closely allied and united, and leading the United Nations.

* * *

To consolidate further the United Nations' total war effort also means that it is necessary to bring about greater national unity within these nations. It requires that labor and the masses of the common people participate more actively and fully in the national unity and the national war effort. It demands also that the laboring masses of all countries collaborate more closely on a world scale in support of the United Nations and for the further strengthening of their common war efforts.

American labor has an important task to perform to help bring about *the greatest popular mass support for the United Nations and their leading coalition.* United action of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. for collaboration with the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee now becomes one of the most important means of strengthening the war effort and of reinforcing the Declaration of the United Nations. Similar cooperation with the Latin American Confederation of Labor and with the labor movement of China will likewise go a long way toward the full integration of the Western

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hemisphere with the United Nations and the rallying of the East Asiatic peoples.

American labor therefore has a great responsibility to continue and strengthen its activities to help rally broader masses of the people for active support to our national policy of consolidating the United Nations, to help realize the primary objective of reinforcing the three-power coalition with a full alliance; to ensure the rapid extension and delivery of Lend-Lease aid to the Soviet Union, China, Britain, and to all our other Allies; to promote on a world scale the development of greater solidarity and unity of action among the peoples of the United Nations for strengthening the war efforts of their countries and governments.

In short: the American labor movement, acting unitedly, should develop still greater initiative and mass activities in support of and for influencing our country's policy—the policy of mobilizing everything for the national war effort, of consolidating the United Nations, and of collaborating along these lines with the labor and democratic movements of these united nations.

This is the policy of collective security and of the unity of action of the workers and peoples of all lands against fascism and fascist aggression, which the Communist Party, guided by our helmsman, Earl Browder, together with other anti-fascist forces, has advocated and consistently championed for many years as the chief means of meeting the fascist menace, of defending the national interests of our country, and of ensuring the peace and security of the world.

This is the policy which is in full harmony with the best democratic and progressive traditions of our own nation, especially of the glorious traditions of Lincoln and Washington, whose anniversaries we Communists are commemorating this month together with all other patriotic Americans. This is the policy which will now triumph in the victorious war of the United Nations dedicated to the destruction of Hitlerism, to national freedom and democratic liberty.

* * *

To consolidate further the total war effort of the United Nations it is essential that much more be done to develop and execute a single world strategy against the Axis powers. This is generally recognized and is gradually being undertaken. But it is not yet fully recognized everywhere that the key decisions on world strategy are primarily questions of what shall be the direction of the main blows against the Axis powers. The direction of the main blow is the question of strategy. This is the way in which President Roosevelt is approaching our war tasks. And the President correctly proposes to solve it by directing the main blow against Hitlerite Germany.

This correct conclusion, namely, the prime need of crushing Hitler Germany, must not be distorted to mean that Japan or Italy are to be left alone; or that our fight against these allies of Hitler is to be only a token fight. On the contrary, our

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fight against Japanese and Italian imperialism must be waged with the greatest energy, determination and effectiveness. At the same time, it is imperative that our plans and actions on every one of the theaters of the single and indivisible war, existing and prospective, must be so organized and conducted as to result in delivering the main blows against Hitler Germany.

On this primary question of anti-Axis strategy, the American people must guard against three dangers: One is that cultivated by various pro-fascist appeasers, like Hoover and Lindbergh, who are now trying to weaken and obstruct the national war effort, to divide the world anti-Hitler coalition and front, to postpone or prevent the defeat and collapse of the Nazi regime—by advocating, among other things, that the United States should let the Soviet Union and Great Britain fight single-handedly against Hitler Germany, while the U.S.A. "concentrates" its efforts solely against Japan.

The foremost advocates of this suicidal policy, of "concentrating our war efforts primarily in the Far East," are the forces who are devoting maximum attention to curtail or halt the vital flow of American war supplies to the U.S.S.R., to the decisive Eastern Front, limited as these are, as well as away from Britain. They are the unAmerican proponents of Hitler's "two-war" and "divide-and-rule" policy who hope to isolate our country from its allies and from its main objective. They are the die-hard Municheers who in the pre-war period also jeopardized and imperiled our national security and world democracy by obstructing and opposing concerted action and a pact of mutual assistance between the United States, the Soviet Union and the other democracies—the policy of collective security against the fascist warmakers championed by the U.S.S.R. and the advanced and anti-fascists in all countries; the policy which could have averted, or more quickly altered the present world situation in favor of the democracies and all peoples. They are the appeasers who today are still plotting to betray America and the peoples by working for a Vichy "negotiated peace" with Hitler.

Another danger is that of considering all theaters of war as of equal strategic importance and to advocate an equal and "balanced" concentration on each front. Hanson W. Baldwin, of the *New York Times*, tends to reflect this point of view. But to adopt such an attitude is to discard all strategy and to fight wildly in all directions without a real plan and without real concentration. Strategy, we repeat, means primarily to determine the direction of the main blow, really to concentrate accordingly, and simultaneously to wage the fight in all other directions for the purpose of *reinforcing the main blow*.

Still another danger is to distort our country's strategy, *i.e.*, the main blow against Hitler Germany, into meaning that the fight against Japan is not very important now and that it can be waged in any old way. Our fight against Japanese imperialism is very important, and precisely

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the standpoint of concentrating our main blows against Nazi Germany. Any weakness of the United Nations in the Pacific and Far Eastern theaters, any failure to develop an effective struggle against Japanese aggression there, may spell a strengthening of Nazi fascism on the European and African theaters of the war.

In the light of this basic strategy, the immediate military task of the United Nations is fairly obvious. *It is to make the year 1942 the year of the end of Hitler Germany.* Some people speak of 1943 as the year of final deliverance, having in mind particularly the fight in the Pacific. But it has to be recognized that the expectation of finishing Japanese imperialism in 1943 hinges primarily upon the ability of the United Nations to finish with Hitler Germany in 1942.

The Soviet Union evidently is orientating on delivering the decisive blows to Nazi Germany this year. This is the great perspective and policy outlined by Stalin in his historic speech on November 6, 1941.* This is the goal toward which the heroic Red Army is steadfastly marching. This is why *Pravda* recently formulated some of the present tasks of the Red Army as follows:

"The valiant Red Army will strike increasingly telling blows, will tirelessly pursue the foe, will encircle and annihiliate him, and not give him respite or opportunity to regroup his forces or to entrench himself on new lines."

* *Stalin Speaks to the World*, Workers Library Publishers.

It is clear that the successful prosecution of these tasks by the Red Army which is being so devotedly and effectively fulfilled in its present history-making counter-offensive will result in a fatal blow at Hitler Germany and its allies. It is creating the conditions for a direct assault for crushing Hitler's armed might in 1942. This estimate is shared not only by the Soviet leaders but also by such Allied spokesmen as Sir Stafford Cripps, who stated in a London broadcast on February 8: "There is every chance of Germany being defeated by this time next year." *It is the primary task of the United Nations actively and unitedly to help insure this outcome because this outcome can and must be insured, providing,* as Sir Stafford stated, that Britain and the United States *"give Russia all the support we can."*

The Soviet Union is not at all complacent, although fully confident of eventual victory. For as Shcherbakov, Secretary of the Moscow Committee of the C.P.S.U., said in his address on Lenin's memorial:

"A serious blow has been inflicted on the enemy, but we should not be complacent and carried away by these successes. The German invaders are not yet routed and they still have forces. We should not forget with what an insidious foe we have to deal. The German invaders have tried and will in the future try to muster forces for a new offensive against our Army. Great efforts and many sacrifices will be required to smash the enemy completely." (*Daily Worker*, January 27).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What should the United Nations do to help the Red Army prevent Hitler from entrenching himself on new lines? What should the United Nations do to insure the defeat of whatever new offensive Hitler may try, and to transform such a defeat into the final defeat of Nazi Germany in 1942?

These are the very essence of the major problems of world anti-Axis strategy because only by crushing Hitler Germany in 1942 will our country and its allies defeat Japanese imperialism in 1943. Not otherwise. The answer, therefore, is threefold: at all costs, it is imperative for the United States and Britain to ensure maximum and timely delivery of tanks, planes, essential raw materials and other war weapons to the Red Army. It is vitally necessary to open a new front (or fronts) on the continent of Europe. At the same time it is necessary greatly to strengthen the struggle in the Pacific and the Far East, giving clearer recognition to the increasingly vital importance of China and providing all the East Asiatic peoples fuller opportunity to participate actively and fully in the war for the defense of their native soil and countries.

The matter of timely and large-scale supplies to the Soviet Union and its Red Army is of paramount importance to the United Nations. Since the key to victory over Hitler Germany lies on the Soviet-German front, and since such a victory would make certain the defeat of Japan, it inevitably follows that, for one thing, the supply policies of the United States and Great Britain must aim to meet, timely and adequately, without further delays and lags, the urgent military needs of the valiant Red Army. This means to act now so as to help frustrate Hitler's plans for a gigantic spring offensive by insuring, among other things, that American and British armaments and war materials to the Soviet Union shall be immediately stepped up and vastly expanded.

Serious mistakes in this sphere would prove very costly. For, as Sir Stafford observed, unless America and Britain go "all out" in their war effort and rapidly extend their material aid to and cooperation with the Soviet Union "there now stands between Hitler and a certain and not too delayed defeat the chance that he may be strong enough to renew his offensive," which "if it comes will be the most critical stage of the whole war."

Therefore the American people and government cannot and must not give too little or too late. The present slowness in fulfilling America's pledges to the U.S.S.R. must be decisively overcome. Any attitude of complacency such as has recently arisen in connection with the first successes of the Soviet counter-offensive, as well as the continued efforts of appeaser elements to block our national policy of aiding and collaborating with the Soviet Union, must be resolutely combated. *For to aid and collaborate with the Soviet Union and its mighty Red Army means to hasten the destruction of Hitler Germany and the Axis, means to aid and de-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fend the most urgent and vital interests of our country and people.

Similarly with the question of opening up of a new front in Europe. Some people think that the Japanese attack in the Pacific precludes all such possibilities. But that is not so. The treacherous attack of Japanese imperialism against our country and its genuine national interests has made it even more necessary for us to hasten the defeat of Hitler Germany. This is so because the defeat of German imperialism—the most predatory and rapacious of all imperialism—has become the main prerequisite for defeating militarist-fascist Japan.

Nor is it true that the present resources of the United Nations, specifically of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, are inadequate for the opening of new fronts in Europe. The primary question here is not so much of adequate resources as of their speedy mobilization and proper strategic utilization. Hence it can be confidently said that the timely consummation of a full all-round alliance between the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain leading the United Nations, could and can produce a united world strategy and common action that will make fully possible the timely opening of a new front in Europe, together with the adequate delivery of supplies to the Red Army and the strengthening of the fight against Japan in the Far East and in the Pacific. The arrival and stationing of American armed forces in Northern Ireland, an event of tremendous importance, is particularly hopeful and promising from this standpoint. It can and should be made part of the preparations for opening a new front in Europe.

Another key problem of world anti-Axis strategy and victory is the vital need of giving clearer recognition to the increasing role and importance of China and the urgent necessity of drawing the East Asiatic peoples—the Filipinos, Malaysians, Indonesians, Indians, Burmese, Chinese, Koreans, Formosans—actively and fully into the joint war effort, as participants in and allies of the United Nations. In China itself, this is, of course, the policy and task of its national government, and of all sectors of the national anti-Japanese front, from the Kuomintang to the Communists; and the formation of unified commands for China and the Pacific should facilitate the realization of this task. But the task is there.

The civilian population of the Philippines have to be drawn in fully and actively into the struggle against the Japanese aggressors, into the defense of their native soil and country. The same in Malaya, Burma, Indo-China, the Dutch East Indies, and in the great country of India. Failures on this score have already proven costly; they may prove even costlier if the present orientation is not rapidly corrected in the direction of enabling the masses of the people of Eastern Asia to participate actively and fully in the fight against Japanese imperialism in defense of their land and their national aspirations.

It is not necessary to exaggerate the effectiveness of the anti-white

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demagogy of the Japanese imperialists and fascists; neither should this be ignored. The brazen pretensions of the Japanese fascist-militarists to being the "liberators" of the Asiatic peoples cannot and will not win the masses of Asia to the support of the barbaric plunder-role and policy of Japanese imperialist aggression and oppression. But these demagogic pretensions can create temporary confusions, especially if certain sections of the East Asiatic peoples should get the impression that the United Nations are not giving them a full opportunity adequately and resolutely to defend their land and country against the depredations of the Japanese-Nazi imperialists, and are not giving recognition to their right to national independence.

To provide these opportunities for the peoples of East Asia is one of the chief means of strengthening the fight against Japan and the Axis. This is one of the ways of strengthening the fight in the Pacific without weakening the main concentration of the Allied war efforts against Hitler Germany. It is an indispensable way of strengthening the entire world anti-Axis strategy and struggle to which the American and all the United Nations are making increasing contributions, and to which our ally the Soviet Union, in particular, is making historic and decisive contributions everywhere, on all fronts—from the epic struggles of the Red Army, its general policy in the Far East and Europe, to its achievements in strengthening the Soviet rear and system.

In mobilizing to consolidate further the unity of action and collaboration of the United Nations, our country and people are orientating and devoting increased attention to the solution of the following interrelated tasks: to reinforce the coalition of the United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain by a full and all-round alliance; to develop a rounded-out world anti-Axis strategy that will insure the concentration of the main blow against Hitler Germany (including the speedy delivery of adequate supplies to the Red Army and opening of a new front in Europe); to strengthen the struggle against Japanese imperialism in the Pacific and Far East and to provide full opportunity for the peoples of East Asia to actively defend their land, their rights, and their countries.

To realize these tasks, the American people are rallying and mobilizing their forces to help unite the nation for a supreme war effort. This is why labor and all democratic forces, including the Communists, are displaying the greatest devotion and self-sacrifice, and are exerting all their influence and strength, all their political and organizing initiative, to advance the national war effort, to guarantee maximum war production, to promote and consolidate labor and national unity, to ensure the fullest participation of labor in the conduct and furtherance of our country's national and democratic war, solidify and extend friendship and collaboration of all peoples against fascist tyranny, for national freedom, democracy and a just peace.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BROWDER WARNED AMERICA

FOREWORD

THE gross injustice of the imprisonment of Earl Browder to our nation is graphically illustrated by the following article. This article, written by Browder in answer to Bruce Bliven, in the *New Republic* of February 2, 1938, makes a devastating answer to the fallacies of isolationism and appeasement. While Mr. Bliven has changed his views and is now a participant in the national unity for smashing Hitler and Hitlerism, Browder's trenchant polemic against his position at that time merits republication today for the great lessons it brings home. The article forecast the disastrous war that would surely develop were the proposals for collective security, then being so militantly championed by the working class and the advanced anti-fascist forces in all lands, and especially by the U.S.S.R., ignored or rejected by the bourgeois-democratic governments. The article, but one of a whole series like it written by Browder on the eve of the Second World War, shows him in all his brilliance as a clear-seeing and resolute leader in the struggle against the growing menace of fascism and war.

Where have the appeasement and isolationism, which Bliven and so many others advocated and which Browder so valiantly combated, led the world? The present holocaust of blood and destruction is the answer. The policy of collective security, of a great peace front of the democratic powers to hold the fascist aggressors in check, which Browder as head of the Communist Party fought for, would have spared the world this terror and desolation.

What, too, about the argument that the policy of collective security was a "Russian" policy, one designed only in the interest of the Soviet state? Browder refuted that completely, and history has borne out fully his analysis. Where are those today who would dare to say that the policy of collective security was not in the interest of our country, as well as of all others threatened by the fascist barbarians? Browder's well-known slogan, "Keep America Out of War by Keeping War Out of the World," which then summed up the collective security policy, was a historically correct statement of the basic interests of the American people.

Typical of Browder's correct analysis of the world situation is his handling of Japan. Answering Bliven's arguments to the effect that not the U.S.A., but the Soviet Union, was in danger from Japan, Browder pointed out that the development of her policy "leads her not to Vladivostok, Khabarovsk and Chita, but rather to Manila, Honolulu and Nome." The Japanese attack upon

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pearl Harbor and the overrunning of the Philippines give history's endorsement to Browder's argument.

Today, certain men who were responsible for the isolationist and appeasement policies that paved the way for bringing the world and our country to their present disastrous plight, sit in high places, unctiously boasting of their Americanism. But Earl Browder, a man who pointed the way to avoid all this slaughter and destruction, lies in Atlanta penitentiary. This is a national disgrace, a shame upon our democracy, a detriment to the national war effort. The people, above all the trade unions, should demand that this blot be removed from our national life and that Browder be released at once, so that he may resume his place in the very front of the forces fighting against Hitlerism.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY

BY EARL BROWDER

MR. BRUCE BLIVEN has confirmed, in his article of December 1, what I had suspected, that the *New Republic's* advocacy of isolation as the proper approach to foreign affairs by the United States has behind it, at least as one factor, a disturbed conscience in relation to 1917. But I am afraid that he has not studied well what the Communists have to say, either about the last World War or about the one now threatening. Clearly, he does not "understand our language." Allow me, therefore, to make an attempt to put the Communist position as nearly as possible in the language of Mr. Bliven himself, in an effort to break down this linguistic barrier.

Can world peace be maintained? That is the first question toward which we must establish an attitude. If we mean world peace in any absolute sense, then of course the question is meaningless, for right now there are two major wars going on which already have resulted in million of casualties. The question then must be, can we prevent the two present wars from extending to engulf the whole world?

The answer to this question must begin with that basic fact that the overwhelming mass of the population of all countries, and the governments of most of them, are afraid of war and desire peace. As President Roosevelt expressed it:

"The peace, the freedom and the security of 90 per cent of the population of the world is being jeopardized by the remaining 10 per cent who are threatening a breakdown of all international order and law."

We can dot the "i" by saying that from which Roosevelt is restrained by diplomatic considerations: Peace is being destroyed by Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado.

Our question is now clearer. Can the fifty to sixty effective governments of the world, with the ardent

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

desire for peace of at least 90 per cent of the world's population behind them, find among themselves sufficient forces for peace to restrain the three war-making powers who may control the remaining 10 per cent of the population but certainly do not command its affection?

Clearly, in this relation of forces, there does exist the possibility of preventing the spread of war, and of extinguishing the wars going on, *provided* the peace-loving 90 per cent can arrive at a concerted program of action, at least to a degree in some relation to that of the concerted action of the Triple Alliance of the "anti-Communist" bloc of fascist states.

What degree of concerted action is necessary? Considering the economic resources of the war-makers, it would clearly be sufficient to bring them quickly to a halt if the United States, France, Britain and the Soviet Union should jointly declare an embargo upon all economic transactions with the aggressors, to be ended when three conditions were met: (1) the withdrawal of all their armed forces into their own territories; (2) the stoppage of all supplies being sent to support civil war in another country; (3) the enforcing of a substantial measure of disarmament.

Considering the military resources of the war-makers, their aggressions would be more quickly stopped, if the peace bloc of powers should, while the aggressions continued, open their markets to the victims of aggression for all their needs, and facilitate their purchases with credits.

Considering the political resurces of the war-makers, they would be quickly isolated if the small nations now falling under their sway once knew that the democratic powers, abandoning their "scuttle and run" policy, were making a firm stand for peace; they would be undermined at home, and their own oppressed population encouraged to reassert themselves, if the peace bloc made a joint declaration of willingness to give full aid and cooperation to any democratic and peaceful government that might succeed the fascist dictatorships.

What are the possibilities that such a policy could be adopted by the four great powers I have named? For the United States, such a policy is clearly indicated as the only possible means of implementing Roosevelt's speech in Chicago on October 5. Clearly, then, in our country the task is to organize effective support behind the President's policy of the 27,000,000 who voted for him in 1936. If that can be done, the United States will uphold its end. It certainly can be done —unless the great masses are also afflicted with the Hamlet-like paralysis that has gripped the minds of the *New Republic's* editors under the hypnosis of fascism, which I cannot believe. As for France, the joy with which Roosevelt's speech was received by the people in that country is sufficient indication that any government which refused a direct proposal from the United States for this policy would be swept out of office in a week and be replaced by a government which would gladly give its adherence. As

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the Soviet Union, it has been urging precisely such a policy for years, and would gladly assume its full share of the responsibility.

There remains Britain. I fully share the doubts of Mr. Bliven about the good faith of the Chamberlain government in the defense of peace. I am also full of doubts about the Labor Party leadership which has found it so easy to go along with Mr. Chamberlain in his, to say the least, equivocal course. But I have great faith in the British working class, which has, more than once, over the heads of its own leaders, called a sharp halt to reactionary adventures of the British government. I am sure that a clear call from the United States, France and the Soviet Union will bring the great British people into line for this policy, under a new government if necessary.

This, in brief and simple outline, is the Communist conception of a correct and effective peace policy for the United States.

If such a program is adopted, whose interests would be served thereby? Surely it would be in the interests of every nation that wants peace; of the small nations that tremble today under the imminent threat of destruction; of the workers of every land; and of every honest democrat.

But Mr. Bliven says no, this is a peculiar "Russian" program, "not framed in American terms or the American interest." We will not quarrel with Mr. Bliven as to how the policy could be best "framed in American terms"; we are willing to leave that to the President, if Mr. Bliven can agree upon such an eminent authority. But we do have a sharp quarrel with him when he says that world peace is a special "Russian" interest, which may be contrary to the interests of America. *Peace* is a *common interest* of the Soviet Union and the United States, and, as the two most powerful and peace-loving nations, *especially* of them.

Mr. Bliven bases his peculiar argument, apparently, upon the opinion that America can *purchase* peace, can *buy off* the aggressor nations with concessions and by granting them a free hand elsewhere. He expresses a deep conviction that any resistance, even purely economic, would lead the United States directly into war. But if the United States *does not dare*, from such fear, to take even economic measures, what reason have we to believe this will insure us from the war danger? It was exactly the conviction that the Nanking government *would not* dare to resist that led Tokyo into the present adventure in China. A continuance of isolation policies by the United States will surely convince the arrogant militarists of Tokyo that now is the time for them to take over the Philippines, Hawaii, Guam and Alaska, as guarantees against the future, when the United States *might dare*. From that it would not be a large step to recall how much more successful are Japanese than Americans in cultivating the beautiful and rich lands of California.

Upon what basis does Mr. Bliven assume that this danger is remote but the danger of a Japanese attack

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the Soviet Union is immediate? Is he relying upon the affinity between two capitalist nations, as against the land of socialism? But Japan knows quite well that the land of socialism is fully armed and ready, a tough nut upon which she might break her teeth. She went into China, *expanding along the line of least resistance*. A continuance of the same line leads her not to Vladivostok, Khabarovsk and Chita, but rather to Manila, Honolulu and Nome.

At the present moment in world affairs, America needs the cooperation of the Soviet Union for her own protection from warlike aggression far more pressingly than the Soviet Union needs America for the same purpose. For the Soviet Union is fully prepared to defend itself, is fully united, and has just cleaned house of the last remnants of those who would cooperate with the enemy. But America, rich and full of potential booty, is still considered by the world to be in a pacifist funk, is torn by a constitutional crisis and sharp class struggles, and contains powerful forces that would welcome Japanese aggression for their own fascist ends.

Mr. Bliven says the program of concerted action for peace proposes "to engage in a bluffing game with the fascist powers." He particularly ascribes to the Communists the idea that "the fascists will be outbluffed and will give way." Nothing could be farther from the truth.

It is my conviction that the fascist dictatorships can be halted only by superior force. But with concerted economic action by the great powers to embargo the aggressors and supply their victims, the superior military force that will halt fascism and bring about its downfall is already in action *in Spain and China*. These two heroic peoples are fighting bravely and steadfastly, and making a good showing *despite* their abandonment by Britain, France and the United States. If we help them, they will do the military job for us, though I hope many thusands more of our best American boys will go to Spain to help the Lincoln Battalion uphold the honor of our people. If we continue to desert them to their fate, as Mr. Bliven advocates, we will have no one to blame but ourselves when we have to take up the full military burden under more unfavorable conditions.

Finally, what is the value of Mr. Bliven's argument that any participation by the United States in a concerted effort for peace would create the danger of extreme reaction, even fascism, coming to power in America precisely as a result of such effort? In my opinion, the truth is exactly the opposite. Only the courageous implementing of the policy laid down by President Roosevelt in Chicago can save our country, and all the capitalist world, from unparalleled reaction and catastrophe.

The greatest threat against domestic progress today, the greatest strength of reaction, lie precisely in the fact, correctly pointed out by Mr. Bliven, that the 27,000,000 who voted for President Roosevelt are not fully united in support of his peace policy. This is true, even though Mr. Bliven underestimates

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grossly the breadth of this support. All the more reason why all progressives, democrats and lovers of peace, all anti-fascists, should do everything possible to build and strengthen that support, and not to tear it down with doubts, fears and hesitations which cover a complete absence of policy, a happy-go-lucky drifting with no guidance but faith in America's lucky star.

If President Roosevelt's policy goes by default, through lack of popular support, if the progressive camp continues to be divided by the paralysis of fear, then I foresee the grave danger that the worst reactionary forces in American public life, playing upon the very real dangers that face the American people, will exploit those fears and the absence of a united progressive policy, with demagogic slogans of "preparedness, more preparedness" and "no entangling alliances" and "America for herself alone" and so on, to stampede the people along the path of reaction, militarism and war.

When our country was in its infancy as an independent nation, when it was relatively weak and surrounded by a hostile world, when it was looked upon by older nations as the source of "revolutionary infection," as the capitalist world today looks upon the Soviet Union—in those days we were not afraid to have a positive policy for peace. We had great leaders then, men with faith that the masses of the people would support them.

When in 1793, France, a new republic such as Spain today, was attacked and blockaded, Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of State under Washington, wrote to James Madison:

"The idea seems to gain credit that the naval powers combining against France will prohibit supplies, even of provisions, to that country. . . . I should hope that Congress . . . would instantly exclude from our ports all the manufactures, produce, vessels, and subjects of the nations committing this aggression, during the continuance of the aggression, and till full satisfaction is made for it."

About the same time Jefferson wrote to Morris, Minister to France, the following:

"We received information that a National Assembly had met, with full power to transact the affairs of the nation, and soon afterwards the Minister of France here presented an application for three million livres, to be laid out in provisions to be sent to France. . . . We had no hesitation to comply with the application . . . and we shall . . . omit no opportunity of convincing that nation how cordially we wish to serve them . . . placing our commerce with that nation and its dependencies on the freest and most encouraging footing possible."

What America needs today, what the world needs, is a foreign policy based upon these lines of Thomas Jefferson. Such a policy has been proposed by President Roosevelt. The whole country must be rallied to support it, and to demand its energetic application in life.

New Republic, February 2, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RIO DE JANEIRO CONFERENCE

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE Third Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the twenty-one American Republics, held under the auspices of the Pan-American Union in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, January 15-18, upon the proposal of Chile, resulted in a significant defeat for the fascist Axis. Hitler and his allies have been eagerly moving to seize Latin America, because of its tremendous natural resources and also because a firm grip in any of the Central and South American countries would provide an excellent jumping-off place for German imperialism to attack the United States.

President Roosevelt, on October 27, exposed the plans of the German fascists to transform all Latin America into five Nazi-dominated vassal states, and a couple of years ago Mussolini insolently stated that the Panama Canal was the frontier of the Axis in the Western Hemisphere. The fascist leaders have spared neither pains nor money to make the Canal, or even the Rio Grande, their front line in the New World. But their grandiose plans received a real check at Rio de Janeiro. There the peoples of this Hemisphere, proceeding on the basis of the Good Neighbor Policy, showed unmistakably that they are increasingly alert to the danger of world fascism and that they are more and more aligning themselves on the side of the United Nations fighting against the Axis mass murderers and enslavers.

The Question of Policy Toward the War

Even before the Conference assembled, nine Latin American Republics—Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Haiti, Nicaragua and Panama—had joined the United States in the war, while three others—Mexico, Colombia and Venezuela—had broken off diplomatic relations with Germany, Italy and Japan. The peoples of the remaining eight Latin American nations—Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Equador, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay—had given unmistakable signs that they, too, were enemies of the Axis powers. The question at Rio, therefore, was not whether the twenty-one Republics would oppose Hitler, but how far and how unitedly they would go against him.

Sumner Welles, head of the United States delegation, declared in his opening speech: "The only assured safety which this Continent possesses lies in full cooperation be-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween us all in the common defense; equal and sovereign partners in times of aggression as in times of peace." This was a diplomatic invitation to a joint declaration of war. This nearly all the countries of the Caribbean area and Central America wanted, but the countries below the "bulge," more exposed to Axis attack and more saturated with fascist propaganda, demanded less drastic action. Nearly all of the latter favored a strong resolution calling for the rupture of diplomatic relations with the Axis powers; but the Argentine government, dominated by the reactionary Acting President Castillo, despite strong pressure from Brazil, Mexico and other Latin American states, managed to force the Conference, which did not want to break the formal all-American unity, to adopt a proposal merely recommending the cutting off of diplomatic relations with the Axis gangster states. The key section of the unanimous resolution reads:

"The American Republics, following the procedure established by their own laws and within the position and circumstances of each country in the actual international conflict, recommend rupture of their diplomatic relations with Japan, Germany and Italy, inasmuch as the first of these states attacked and the other two declared war on an American country."

The Axis powers sought to prevent hostile action by the Latin American states. Their agents swarmed about the Rio Conference, trying to terrorize the delegates; while the Berlin and Tokio foreign offices made direct threats against Brazil, Mexico, Bolivia and Chile. The fascists hailed the disruptive stand of Argentina and ridiculed the final resolution as a defeat for the United States. But such efforts of the Axis were largely unavailing. During the course of the conference seven additional South American states broke off relations with the Axis, leaving only Chile and Argentina, which have not taken such action. Chile, too, as indicated by the recent election of Rios, who was backed by the anti-Hitler forces, will probably break with the Axis; and it is likely also that the people of Argentina, who are overwhelmingly anti-fascist, will force their reactionary government to do likewise. The Rio Conference showed that the peoples of all the Americas, despite Axis pressure from abroad and fifth column treachery at home, are bound together in anti-Hitler solidarity and are headed for an eventual all-out participation in the war of the United Nations against the fascist Axis.

It was a foregone conclusion that, at the Rio de Janeiro Conference, the Latin American Republics would move definitely against the Axis powers. The value of the conference is to be measured by the extent to which it accomplished the great task, thrust upon it by history, of helping to organize all the millions of the Americas for joint anti-Axis struggle. The conference achieved much, despite the fact that the main resolution, above cited, was watered down to conciliate Argentina. For there were forty other resolutions, mostly recommenda-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, adopted, including an endorsement of the Atlantic Charter. These resolutions, relating to complex military, economic and political questions, went far to develop a war course for the combined American nations, not excluding Argentina and Chile.

The Military Problem

The conference delegates were in their great majority keenly alert to the danger of invasion from the predatory Axis powers and the need for adopting joint military measures to defend the Hemisphere. This danger was utilized by isolationist and appeasement elements in the more remote countries of Argentina and Chile, which are in a position of special vulnerability to Axis attack, while it lent great anti-Axis militancy to Brazil (acutely threatened from Dakar) and to Mexico (menaced by Japan), countries which are in a better position to receive effective military and naval cooperation from the United States.

Not unnaturally, the delegates from Latin America considered carefully what help they might expect from the United States in case of Axis attack. One correspondent (Chicago *Daily News*, January 15) summed up their attitude as follows: "If we break off relations with the Axis has Uncle Sam enough battleships, cruisers, destroyers and planes to defend us now against Axis reprisals?" The incredible debacle of the American land, air and naval forces at Pearl Harbor, and the weakness currently being shown by Great Britain at Singapore, were anything but reassuring indications to the virtually unarmed Latin American countries. On the other hand, the big victories of the Soviet Union against Nazi Germany greatly encouraged the Latin Americans and convinced them of the possibility of defeating the Axis. The prevalent admiration for the Red Army was skillfully used by Sumner Welles, who twice referred to its successes. He said:

"Today the German armies are retreating from Russian territory, routed and dispersed by the magnificent offensive of the Russian armies. Hitler has lost over one-third of his air-force, over one-half of his tank force, and more than 3,000,000 men. But more than that, the German people now see for themselves the utter fallacy of the promises held out to them by the evil charlatan who rules them."

The conference did not make public all the military measures now being taken to defend the Hemisphere, especially regarding the disposition of American naval forces and the progress being made toward building up the chain of Hemisphere encircling naval and air bases. Nevertheless, a number of important steps were decided on by the conference or in connection with it, including United States-Mexico military cooperation to protect the west coast of Mexico frrom Japanese marauders; the United States-Brazil joint action against threatened Nazi invasion via Dakar; the allocation of $20,000,000 by the U.S. to five Central American countries to complete the Pan-American military highway from the United States to the Panama Canal;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the allotment of $20,000,000 by the U.S. to Uruguay under Lend-Lease provisions, and the proposed holding of a joint conference of the general staffs of Chile, Argentina, Brazil and Peru on continental defense matters. But of greatest importance was the adoption of a resolution to call immediately in Washington a military and naval conference of delegates appointed by each of the governments, "to study and recommend to them the measures necessary for the defense of the continent." Another military matter of significance disposed of by the conference was the settlement of the 100-year-old border dispute between Ecuador and Peru, a quarrel which recently burst into open warfare and which Axis agents have done their utmost to inflame.

In comment upon these actions by the conference it may be said that the key to the great task of the military defense of the Western Hemisphere is that this defense must be a joint enterprise of all the nations, from Hudson's Bay to Cape Horn, as part of the United Nations. The United States, notwithstanding the big demands made upon it by the decisive front against Hitler in the U.S.S.R. as well as by the front in Africa and by the far-flung battle lines against Japan in the Far East, must also extend powerful support to the at present militarily weak countries south of the Rio Grande. At the same time, these countries should develop their own strong military potentialities. At present the twenty Latin American lands have about 1,400,000 soldiers and reserves, partly or wholly equipped. When necessary, these forces could be strengthened with United States lend-lease assistance. By the adoption of universal military conscription systems and the appropriation of maximum war budgets, the Latin American countries can develop a formidable military force; one which, acting jointly with the United States, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and China, can not only successfully repel all Axis invaders, but also play a positive world role in the military strategy of the United Nations. It would be a basic mistake, however, for Latin America merely to rely upon the United States to defend the Western Hemisphere. The greatest military efficiency of the united American peoples, as well as the full preservation of the sovereignty of the Latin American lands, requires imperatively that these countries arm themselves and proceed with the United States, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and China as equal military partners in the war of the United Nations against the Axis. To accomplish this goal requires especially that the Latin American countries enter into full diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R.

The Economic Problem

In its task of mobilizing the peoples of the Western Hemisphere against Hitler the Rio Conference faced many thorny and urgent economic problems. Sumner Welles said correctly: "Of equal importance with measures of political solidarity, defense and cooperation, and the repression of subversive activity are economic measures related to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conduct of war against the aggressor nations and the defense of the Western Hemisphere." Among the major economic problems facing the conference were the urgent need for the United States to secure new sources of supplies of strategic war commodities to replace those cut off by Axis war action; and the need to speed up war production generally in Latin America; the allocation of finances and commodities by the United States to strengthen the weakened Latin American economies; the mutual control of prices; the pooling of the economic resources of the Hemisphere countries, for the United Nations, and the general question of the industrialization of Latin America.

Although the United States delegation at Rio de Janeiro spoke somewhat softly upon the question of a general war declaration and also regarding measures being taken for the military defense of the Hemisphere, its voice was loud and insistent upon economic matters. Mr. Welles put before the conference an elaborate economic program, most of which was summed up in eight points, under the title of the Hemisphere War Production Plan, and stated by the *Associated Press*, on January 22, as follows:

"1. Recommendations that each country take steps to minimize trade barriers on strategic materials for the duration of the emergency.

"2. A program whereby the intricacies of foreign exchange would be eliminated by a common denominator for international trade between anti-Axis countries.

"3. Joint use of all merchant ships with the United States and other large maritime nations providing naval and air convoys.

"4. Construction throughout the hemisphere of a multitude of projects designed to speed war production.

"5. That all airlines in the hemisphere be operated by bona-fide nationals of each country.

"6. Assurances that essential imports required by various Latin American governments will be made available to the extent consistent with each country's defense requirements.

"7. Exchange of skilled workers and technical missions so that new war industries can be established throughout the continent.

"8. Operation of a Pan-American statistical union to provide a standard inter-American formula for determining the assets and liabilities, financial and economic, of each country."

In the main the conference acted within the framework of the United States proposals. Argentina showed more cooperation on economic than on foreign policy. The conference declared for cutting off economic relations with the Axis powers; the mobilization of all shipping; the holding of an international conference to set up a stabilization fund; the freezing of funds belonging to Axis nationals; the closing of telephones, telegraphs and the radio to enemy forces; and the speeding up generally of war production.

Meanwhile the United States delegation was busily employed working out its economic program with the respective Latin American states. Important steps taken were

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sixteen agreements (with more probably to follow) with Latin American countries to eliminate tariff barriers between them during the war emergency. Announcement was also made that Douglas MacKeachnie, Director of the Division of Purchases, had already allocated to Latin American countries 26 of the 110 vital commodities necessary to relieve their priorities crisis. In accordance with Mr. Welles' statement that the United States "is ready to enter into broad agreements for the acquisition of supplies of basic strategic materials, and to cooperate with each of the other American Republics in order to increase rapidly and efficiently their production for emergency needs," announcement was made that the United States Government had signed a contract with Chile to take over all its surplus of strategic commodities, that a loan of $25,000,000 had been made to Bolivia mainly to develop its valuable tin mines and that their output would be bought by the United States; that a definite settlement had been arrived at with Mexico on the oil question, and that arrangements were being made to buy the entire supplies of Cuba's sugar crop. Mr. Aranha, Foreign Minister of Brazil, especially hailed Mr. Welles' economic program, assuring him that sufficient supplies of rubber, tin, manganese, coffee and many other important commodities could be secured by the United States in Latin America, without going to the Far East and to other remote parts of the earth for them. Responding to Mr. Welles' suggestion, the conference also decided to have the Inter-American Technical Economic Conference survey the probable economic problems of post-war Western Hemisphere.

The measures of the Rio Conference went a considerable distance toward meeting the present difficult economic situation in Latin America and to mobilize the productive power of the Western Hemisphere against Hitler and his allies. Yet there are various inadequacies and dangers in them which must be guarded against—especially if the economic independence of the Latin American states is to be preserved.

Regarding the question of loans for economic purposes by the United States: First, the quantity of these needs to be drastically increased. During the crisis of the 1930's the export of United States capital to Latin America fell to zero, with some 80 per cent of American loans to the governments of those countries in default. Since then the Export-Import Bank has outstanding but $131,000,000 in loans, which is only a drop in the bucket in so far as the needs of this vast undeveloped area is concerned. If the full economic war power of Latin America is to be developed, therefore, Uncle Sam will have to loosen up his purse strings, and quickly. Moreover, the United States loans must be changed in character. Departing from previous practices, they should permit of the general industrialization of the Latin American countries and not bear the imperialistic restrictions limiting them to the development of public works,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

transportation, and the extraction of raw materials needed in the United States.

Regarding the elimination of trade barriers in the Hemisphere: Economically healthy are the tendencies to break down trade barriers between the various Latin American countries (for example, the River Plata Conference between Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay and Bolivia, looking toward freer trade among these countries) and also the plans to admit Latin American products duty free into the United States. During the war it is necessary to get all possible United States war goods into Latin America, but simply to cast aside permanently all tariffs in Latin American countries against United States industrial commodities would mean to put the feeble industries of these countries at a serious disadvantage with regard to the powerful industries of the United States.

Regarding the absorption of Latin American economic surpluses by the United States: Up until the involvement of this country in the war little had been done in this vital matter in an organized way, although much talk was heard about it at Pan-American Union Conferences. Almost the only thing concrete that had been accomplished was the formation of the International Coffee Agreement between fifteen countries, with the placing of cocoa and cotton for study. The war emergency program which is now developing and which calls for the utilization of the Latin American economic surpluses by the U.S.A. and the United Nations as a whole should not only be greatly enlarged as a war measure, but it should also be continued after the war. Practical forms, under the conditions there prevailing, should be worked out.

Regarding the financing of free ports, airlines, etc.: While most of the money for these necessary projects necessarily must come from the United States, their economic and political control must remain strictly in the hands of the governments concerned.

Finally, regarding the proposed emergency labor program, which provides for the shifting of skilled labor to the points where it is most needed: Bearing in mind the many dictatorial exploiters with which Latin America is so heavily afflicted, the trade unions of all the countries of the Hemisphere, particularly the Latin American Confederation of Labor, will need to be on the alert in the application of this measure, to prevent gross abuses.

The Political Problem

The major political problem before the Rio Conference, relating to the internal affairs of the states, was that of smashing of the fifth column in Latin America (no one spoke of the powerful fifth column in the United States, which, under the banner of the America First Committee, got a serious setback upon our entry into the war). The German, Japanese and Italian governments, for several years past, have been making great efforts to build their fifth column forces throughout Latin America. Their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

main organizational base has been their consular staffs, which have been greatly increased since the war began. Numbering 5,000 or more persons, these staffs functioned as a wide network of espionage and pro-Axis organizational activities. They were linked up with the strong Axis business interests throughout Latin America, and they found a powerful support, not only among the numerous nationals of the Axis countries, but also among the great landed and industrial interests, as well as among the reactionary circles of the Catholic Church hierarchy. One of the principal instruments of this powerful fifth column is the Spanish Falange. This body, stimulated by the Franco government and financed by Hitler, propagates the illusion of a great resurrected Spanish Empire in the event of a Nazi victory. The Falange is strong in a number of Latin American countries, notably Mexico, where it claims some 500,000 adherents. The political line of the Trotskyite groups throughout the Hemisphere, with their opposition to the anti-Hitler war, their denunciation of all cooperation with the United States, and their violent attacks upon the U.S.S.R., fitted right in with the general line of the Axis fifth column.

With the intensification of the world war and the sharpening of the conflict between the United States and the Axis powers, especially since the involvement of the U.S.S.R. in the war, the fifth column in Latin America greatly increased its boldness and activities. Insolently arming and uniforming its forces and openly plotting to seize various Latin American governments, it operated under slogans reminiscent of the erstwhile America First Committee. It contended that the main enemy was not Hitler, but the Roosevelt Government and the Soviet Union, and that the national policy everywhere in Latin America to follow was one of "isolation," "neutrality" and "appeasement" of the Axis powers. Especially after the United States became a full belligerent did the Latin American fifth column press forward with its program of putschism and support for the Axis.

Meanwhile the democratic and anti-Axis forces intensified the fight against this dangerous fascist movement. In many countries known Nazi and Japanese agents were arrested; in Bolivia, July, 1941, the Nazi-inspired putsch was crushed; in Panama, during October of the past year, the Nazi-influenced President Arias was deposed. The United States put on the blacklist thousands of firms doing business with the Axis powers; during the past year over 5,000 miles of Axis-controlled airline in Latin America were taken over by the governments concerned; the notorious Trans-Ocean Service was abolished everywhere except in Argentina; the transatlantic airlines to the Axis countries were closed down. After the United States entered the war and as the Rio de Janeiro conference approached this economic and political warfare against the Axis fifth column grew more and more intense.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The trade unions, Communist Parties and other people's organizations in Latin America are playing a leading role in developing the fight against the Axis and their powerful fifth column, and for the national interests of the Latin American countries. One of the most striking features of this growing democratic struggle was the demand of the labor movements throughout Latin America, as well as of many other organizations, for the release of Comrade Browder. Long before American labor began to demand Browder's freedom the Latin American trade unions had gone on record for it. The Latin Americans have linked their fight for Browder with that for Prestes. V. L. Toledano, President of the Confederation of Latin American Workers (C.T.A.L.) expressed the anti-Axis spirit of the great toiling masses of Latin America in the following telegram to the Rio Conference:

"The Latin American working class, which has followed the work of the conference with great interest, offers to you and all the governments in the Western Hemisphere its sincere and enthusiastic cooperation in the common work of continental defense, believing that all aid denied this historic task is treason to the cause of human liberties and independence."

Likewise outspoken and militant in the fight against the Axis were the Communist Parties of the Hemisphere. In Argentina, Chile, Mexico, Cuba, Uruguay, Colombia, Peru, etc., as well as in Canada and the United States, they raised their voices for national unity in their respective countries, for Hemisphere solidarity, for alliance with the U.S.S.R. and all of the United Nations for all-out struggle against Hitler and his allies. Secretary Labarca of the Communist Party of Chile sounded clearly the general anti-fascist line of the Communist Parties of the Hemisphere when he declared at a great meeting of 15,000 people in Santiago on January 3rd:

"The American peoples have one answer to give—to form a continental military alliance, together with the United States, England and the U.S.S.R., for the complete destruction of fascism."

The Rio de Janeiro Conference adopted a number of sharp measures against the fifth column. The breaking off of diplomatic and economic relations with the Axis powers, with a consequent disruption of the great Nazi consular and business spy and putsch organization, was a heavy blow. Together with this, the conference called for various restrictions upon enemy aliens, the liquidation of their organizations, radio stations, etc. Provisions were made also for an inter-American conference to be held next May in Buenos Aires, to work out ways to combat fifth column activities.

That the Rio Conference recognized, in a measure at least, the great role and prestige of the U.S.S.R. among the Latin American peoples and the growing influence of the Communist Parties, was shown by its soft-pedaling the tendency to lump Communism with fascism as a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subversive element. The conference was notably free from red-baiting, and Mr. Welles, in summing up its work, specified by implication whom the conference considered to be the fifth column when he said: "All subversive activities directed by the Axis powers or states subservient to them are brought under rigid control." This is not to say, however, that reactionary elements throughout the Hemisphere will discontinue their attempts to turn the fire against the Communist Parties, who are in the forefront of the peoples' struggle to defend their countries and to smash Hitler and the Axis.

The Rio Conference has stimulated the mass fight against the Axis fifth column. In increasing measure, Axis spy diplomats are being hustled out, phony businessmen isolated, and fascist organization leaders arrested. In Brazil especially the pro-Hitler elements suffered a reverse. The sharpened offensive against the Axis forces in Latin America is exemplified by the Presidential election in Chile on February 1, where the rightist General Carlos Ibanez, openly supported by Nazi and other fascist organizations, was defeated by the popularly supported candidate, Juan Antonio Rios, by a substantial majority. During the Rio Conference the Chilean population displayed many signs of disagreement with the failure of the Chilean delegation to support a break with the Axis. The elections gave them an opportunity to register their opposition concretely.

It would be folly to conclude, however, from all this that the fifth column has been destroyed in Latin America. Far from it. The monster has been wounded but not killed. The Axis forces are still very powerful in virtually every Latin American country, and undoubtedly will continue to put up a serious fight. Especially dangerous is the situation in Argentina, where the pro-fascist Castillo gang is in control of the government. This gives Hitler a stronghold from which to carry on his poisonous activities all over South America. Castillo, head of the Conservative Party, mainly represents the great landowners. What kind of a clique this is may be gauged from the fact that "about 39 per cent of the area of Buenos Aires Province, the richest agricultural patch in America, home of 3,500,000, is held in 230 farms, averaging some 47,000 acres each" (*New Republic*, Jan. 19). But the situation in Argentina is far from hopeless. The Socialist, Communist, Radical, Progressive and Democratic Parties, as well as the whole labor movement, are lined up against Castillo. The anti-fascist elements control the lower house of Congress; they have the backing of the mass of the people, and, in the coming March elections, they will score a victory in spite of Castillo's present desperate efforts to choke Argentina's democracy by setting up a "state of siege" —if the mandate of the people is not thwarted by fraud and violence, as was the case in the recent provincial elections. The anti-Hitler forces will be victorious, as the Communist Party of Argentina declared in its statement of Dec. 20.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"If the different sectors interested in respect for the Constitution and the law, opposed to governments of violence and fraud, and active in the normal functioning of the collective organisms—of Parliament in the first instance—come together, give each other reciprocal support against the dictatorial excesses of the Executive Power, and coordinate the common action against the agents of Hitler, the arbitrary acts of the present government against the people *will cease,* its 'neutrality' policy favorable to the Axis *will terminate,* and the formation of a National Government will result perforce. It is the aim of the Communists, of the anti-fascists, of all patriots, to make the utmost efforts to unite all the Argentine people, the nation, and direct their acts toward strengthening the independence of the country. In case the Government continues its policy of hostility toward the activity of the democratic and anti-Nazi forces, of the advocates of collaboration with the United States, of those organized in support of the continental defense against the Nazi-fascist aggressors, the working class and all the democratic forces must foster, advance and support all the patriotic measures and initiatives, no matter where they come from, whose objective is to strengthen the defense of the nation and destroy the aggressor forces of the Axis. Whatever may be the conditions under which these forces have to act, in the interest of the national safety and defense, they must work toward the end that the foreign policy of the country shall orient itself toward the participation of Argentina in the continental and world front of struggle against Hitlerism and other aggressor powers of the Axis. All the other questions of domestic policy must be considered in relation to this *central aim* and subordinated to it."

The Fight Ahead

The Rio de Janeiro Conference represented a real defeat for the Axis powers and a victory for the world forces of democracy. But the battle to win the Hemisphere for an all-out struggle against Nazi Germany and its allies has by no means been carried to completion. The compromise resolution, merely recommending the breaking off of diplomatic relations with the Axis powers, which was adopted so as to preserve a formal unity with Argentina and Chile, was only a step in the right direction. But it was a step that will surely be followed by others, until all the peoples of the Americas, from Canada to Cape Horn, stand where they belong, as full participants in the war of the United Nations against Hitlerism.

In their determination to fight the menace of world fascism the peoples of the Americas, especially those of Latin America, face many heavy and urgent problems. There is the big task of achieving national unity of all anti-Hitler forces, real unity of action of all the governments toward the war, and of mobilizing the peoples; there is the necessity of translating the decision of the Rio Conference into reality in the various countries, there is the urgent need to arm themselves against possible Nazi or Japanese invasions; there are many complex and pressing economic questions; there is the deadly threat of the fascist fifth column, which remains strong throughout Latin America.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The United States, in helping solve these difficult problems, bears a heavy responsibility. It is true that in this war our country has heavy and urgent tasks in other zones of the world war struggle; nevertheless it must not neglect the vital Latin American area. Out of its great and rapidly developing war strength the United States must find means to offer substantial cooperation to the weaker Latin American states. Especially must it extend economic collaboration and provide the munitions now so urgently needed by many countries south of the Rio Grande. It must also stand ready to give these countries strong air, naval and military support in case of Axis attack.

The key to developing united action by all the countries of the Western Hemisphere against the fascist Axis is a genuine application of the Good Neighbor policy by the United States, and the closest collaboration with the United Nations. In its economic, political and military dealings with the other countries of this Hemisphere the United States must strictly respect their sovereign rights as independent nations. A great danger to be guarded against in this general respect comes from the pro-fascist imperialist circles in this country, particularly those represented by the Hoover, Lindbergh, Hearst camp who would utilize the war situation to set up U.S. economic and political hegemony over the whole Western Hemisphere.

The central task in Latin America, following up the Rio Conference, is to mobilize the great masses for full participation in the war against Hitler and Hitlerism, and to establish national unity. Here organized labor and other democratic and progressive forces in our land share the responsibility. They must set up a closer cooperation than ever with the peoples of Latin America; they must be on guard to defeat the machinations of the pro-Hitlerite imperialist fifth columnists of this country in Latin America. They must see to it that the United States government works together with the other anti-Hitler governments of the Hemisphere in a true spirit of equality, mutual solidarity and cooperation. In all this work, especially the trade unions of this country should develop a closer cooperation with the Confederation of Latin American Workers (C.T.A.L.).

The building of a great front of all the American peoples as an organic part of the world anti-Hitler front is indispensable in order to prevent the Axis mass murderers and enslavers from getting a grip in this hemisphere. At the same time, this vast front of peoples and nations will not be simply a passive, defensive force. Together with the Soviet Union, Great Britain, China, India, and the peoples of the occupied countries, the democratic nations of the Western Hemisphere, bound together in firm solidarity, will play a vital role in the common task of destroying world fascism—the Berlin-Rome-Tokio Axis—and of establishing the just peace for which the peoples of the world are now longing and fighting.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FAR EASTERN FRONT IN THE WAR AGAINST THE AXIS

BY JAMES S. ALLEN

I.

JAPAN'S far-flung aggression across the Pacific against the United States, the Philippines, the South Seas countries and Australasia emphasizes anew in bold outline the centralized strategy of the Nazi-fascist Axis in its war for world domination. The piratical foray in force of military-fascist Japan has again exposed the indivisible nature of the war. It has underlined the urgent necessity for the anti-Axis nations to establish the closest united front and to formulate a single strategy on a world scale for victory over the Hitler-dominated bloc. Again it is made unmistakably apparent that the Chinese war of liberation is basically linked with the just war being waged by the Soviet Union, England, the United States and their allies against Hitlerism in the West and its Axis partner in the East. The new Axis onslaught underlines vigorously as the paramount question the imperative necessity of the closest military and political alliance between the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain and China for the joint prosecution of the war on a world scale —for an indivisible victory and an indivisible peace.

The timing and direction of Japan's new aggression coincided with the needs of Nazi Germany arising from its first major defeats of the war, suffered on the Eastern Front. By December 7 the Soviet counter-offensive was already well under way. On the part of Hitler, the opening of the new threater of war in the Pacific was calculated to play the role of a major diversion, with the objective of engaging British and American forces and supplies, thus seeking to divert Allied naval and air power from the Atlantic, the Mediterranean and the Middle East. At the same time it was hoped to create division within the anti-Hitler coalition over the relative weight of the new front in the war as a whole. An equally important objective was to slow down, and possibly to halt entirely, the supply of lend-lease materials to the Soviet Union in the expectation that once having pulled through the difficult winter the Nazi armies could launch their much-heralded spring offensive. The fact that the Japanese offensive was not launched against Siberia is a tribute in the first place to the strength of the U.S.S.R., including its formidable Far Eastern defenses.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Japanese military-fascists were evidently pleased to take what seemed to them the direction of least resistance, which promised to provide the quickest results in the form of territorial acquisitions and essential war materials before the United States was adequately prepared and the Allied coalition fully developed. The aspiration of the Japanese military-fascist circles for the complete conquest of China and the creation of an East Asia sphere of unchallenged domination coincided with the immediate tactical objectives which Hitler hoped to obtain in diverting and dispersing Anglo-American power and in unfolding the new phase of his drive for world power.

Despite the temporary military victories already won by Japan, by far the most important outcome of the opening of the new front is to be found in the accelerated growth of the world anti-Hitler coalition. This was signalized by the entry of the United States into the war as a full-fledged combatant, in collaboration with Great Britain, the U.S.S.R. and their allies. This development was accompanied by the rousing of the whole American people and the hastening of national unity, speeding up the mobilization of the total productive and armed power of the nation.

The strengthening of the anti-Axis coalition which has developed since December 7 is further evidenced by the recent inter-Allied military conferences and the Declaration of the United Nations. The conferences between the chief powers held simultaneously in Washington, Moscow and Chungking resulted in important steps toward establishing a single world strategy for the defeat of Hitler. The conference between Eden and Stalin in Moscow indicated even closer collaboration between England and the Soviet Union in the war against Hitlerism, thereby consolidating the whole anti-Hitler coalition, while the Washington and Chungking conferences undoubtedly brought the four major powers of the anti-Hitler bloc closer on the main problems of the war as a whole. The latter conferences also led to the first concrete steps toward joint commands, although still only on a regional scale: in the Southwest Pacific area the establishment of a supreme command under General Sir A. Wavell over all the British, American, Dutch and Australian sea, land and air forces; and the establishment under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek of a supreme command over all the land and air forces of the United Nations in China, as well as for operations against Indo-China and Thailand. Not of least significance in forming these supreme commands was the placing of all branches of the armed forces—sea, land and air—under a single general staff to bring about full coordination of all arms, a step which may foreshadow similar and much-needed changes elsewhere.

While not yet having the significance of a full military alliance between the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, China and the twenty-two other signatory nations, the Declaration of the United Nations was a great step toward

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worldwide coordination and cooperation, in that each government pledged to employ its full resources to bring about the defeat of the Axis and to cooperate with all those adhering to the pact, while promising not to make a separate peace. These moves, which can facilitate the development of a full military and political alliance between all the powers engaged in the war against the Axis, are of great significance in marking a major turn toward fuller collaboration, which is essential for a unified offensive for victory planned and carried out on a world scale.

These steps toward fuller collaboration have already resulted in stiffening resistance of the ABCD powers in the Far Pacific. They have already borne fruit in the victories of the Chinese armies at Changsha and in the direction of Canton, in the dispatch of a Chinese army for the defense of Burma, and in the offer of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek to send an army of liberation into Japanese-held Indo-China and Thailand. That the first military advances in the Far East since December 7 should have been scored by China proves again not only the value of an alliance with China, but that decisive victories can be won even against superior forces when the people are fully engaged in the defense of their own security and independence.

However, the generally favorable turn toward closer cooperation of the world anti-Hitler front must not be permitted to obscure the extremely critical situation in the South Seas and its serious bearing upon the war as a whole. It would, indeed, be dangerous to underestimate the extent of the damage already inflicted by the military-fascist machine of Japan, and the danger to the security of our own country arising from these preliminary defeats. The Japanese have succeeded in taking us completely off guard at Pearl Harbor and inflicting damage to our main Pacific naval base serious enough to delay relief of vital besieged points in the Far Pacific. Guam and Wake have fallen, eliminating the shortest route for air ferries from Hawaii to the Far East. In the Philippines, the port of Davao on the island of Mindanao, Joho and most of Luzon, the principal island of the group, have been occupied. The relatively rapid immobilization of Luzon as an immediate base for the United Nations contributed heavily to cutting off and therefore losing Hong Kong. The fall of Hong Kong and Manila eliminated for the moment the offensive arm pointed toward Japan and the occupied areas of China, and at the same time destroyed an important communications line to free China. From the southern isles of the Philippine Archipelago, Japan was able to launch her drive against the Dutch East Indies, establishing a number of bases in Borneo and Celebes. She also established bases on New Guinea and the Mandated Islands of Australia, thus placing herself athwart the direct line of supply between America and the whole South Seas area. In the meantime, from Thailand, which she won without a struggle, Japan swept

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down over the Malay peninsula toward Singapore, the heart of the Straits defense area. Then the Japanese war machine plunged into Burma, the gateway to India, and threatens Rangoon, chief port to the Burma Road, which is China's main supply route with the Western powers.

As a result of the blitz attack Japan was able to establish temporary superiority in the air and on the seas in the Southwestern Pacific. At the end of two months of war she has penetrated into some of the most strategic and vital supply centers of the Southwest Pacific and has secured a number of key military and naval bases, for the time being placing the Allied nations on the defensive. Among her subjected peoples are now to be found Filipinos, Malaysians and the Thais, and she has strengthened her grip over Indo-China. She is bombing the Burmese, the Sumatrans, the Javanese, the Australians. India is for the first time directly threatened. Clearly if the Dutch East Indies, Australia and Burma were overrun by Japan this would be a most damaging blow for the United Nations. It would have immediate negative effects upon China, India, the Middle East and the defense economies of Britain and the United States, while greatly increasing the resources and striking power of the Axis, thus making necessary a much more protracted and costly war.

The United Nations can turn the tide of battle in the Southwest Pacific before such heavy losses are sustained. But if further and more serious setbacks are to be avoided, it is necessary to overcome the grave weaknesses and mistakes made manifest by the initial defeats.

II.

It is well to begin with an examination of the causes for the military setback in the Philippines, for here our country is most directly involved and the reverses eased Japan's drive into the South Seas. The Philippine experience also throws considerable light on the situation in the other colonial areas of the Southwest Pacific now involved in the war. The lessons to be learned from a frank evaluation of mistakes can apply with equal force throughout the Far Pacific, and they are all the more important because continued military defeats or withdrawals are far from being inevitable. On the contrary, conditions exist for a successful counter-offensive by the United Nations which will liberate the areas overrun by Japan.

The Philippines are not yet lost and are so situated as to be able to contribute greatly toward turning the tide of battle in the Far East. The center of the conflict in the Pacific is now shifting to Singapore, the Dutch East Indies, Burma, and Australia; and India is now called upon to play an important, if not decisive role. But even if the gallant forces under General MacArthur should be forced out of the combat, the Philippines can still be considered an important field of battle.

Up to the time of writing, the Japanese have entrenched themselves only on three important

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Islands—Luzon, Joho and a portion of Mindanao. Luzon has an area roughly equivalent to the area of New York State, and a population of six or seven million. With the exception of the main line of battle on Luzon, the Japanese troops must be thinly dispersed, holding lines of communication and important economic centers. It was on Luzon that Filipino guerrilla troops, armed largely with home-made guns and bolos, held out for three years against American occupation forces at the turn of the century. Here, too, the labor-peasant and progressive movements have reached highest levels, and there exists a vital Communist Party with great mass influence, which is helping rally and mobilize the Filipino people for the war of national liberation. On Mindanao, the Japanese are strongly entrenched at the port of Davao, the center of the Japanese community; but Filipinos and Moros, with fierce traditions of independence, still control the rest of the vast island. Besides, such important, densely populated islands as the Visayas, Cebu, Leyte, as well as numerous other isles, still seem to be untouched by the Japanese. With the example of China before us, and remembering the patriotic and fighting qualities of the Filipinos, we must recognize that the Philippine Archipelago can perform a great role in helping to stem the tide of Japanese invasion in the Pacific area.

Clearly, the reason for the reverses in the Philippines is not to be found in any lack of courage and heroism on the part of the American and Filipino forces. The joint American-Filipino army has fought and is fighting with the greatest courage and tenacity, and the Filipinos, with some American aid and encouragement, are waging a guerrilla struggle against the invader at many points, under great hardships and in the face of overwhelming military superiority. Also there is much evidence of passive resistance and sabotage against the Japanese authorities in the occupied regions.

The gravest mistake, not only in the Philippines but throughout the Southwest Pacific, was the failure to mobilize and organize on a broad scale the native populations for defense of their homes and their land. According to the press, the total armed forces in the Philippines at the time of the Japanese attack was considerably less than the invading army, which numbered about 200,000 men with superior equipment. The number of Filipinos in all branches of the armed forces did not equal one half of 1 per cent of the *total population of 16,000,000!*

The failure to mobilize and organize the people—who have a long tradition of heroic struggle for freedom and independence, and who possess the spirit of authentic patriotism and nationalism—made it easier for the powerful Japanese-Falangist fifth column demagogically to utilize "national liberation" and "anti-imperialist" propaganda to delay and immobilize the resistance which arose spontaneously among the people. There was no effective and widespread organization and direction of guerrilla fighting, of which the Filipinos are past

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masters. Instead, exclusive reliance was placed upon fighting from fixed and fortified positions from which the army was compelled by superior forces to retreat. As a whole, the Filipino people, who directly had most at stake in the battle for the Philippines, were relegated to the role of mere onlookers or defenseless victims of the Japanese air raids. To these mistakes must be added the failure fully to realize a scorched-earth policy, the outstanding example of which was declaring Manila an open city, leading to the surrender without a struggle of the very center of Filipino national life.

The reasons for the state of unpreparedness of the islands and the mistakes made in undertaking its defense have deep roots, especially in the events of recent years.

In the first place, it is necessary to recognize that the present defeats are closely linked with and were facilitated by the former policy of appeasement which the United States followed toward Japan since 1931-32, when the military-fascists overran Manchuria and attacked Shanghai. As is well known, this policy became interlinked with the general appeasement of Hitler by England, France and the United States through Spain, Munich and the first stages of the new world war. In the Far East, the pursuance of this policy toward Japan was all the more dangerous for our own security because it compromised our commitments made directly to China and the Philippines. But appeasement continued to influence our country's policy after July, 1937, when Japan launched the present stage of its aggressions against China, even after 1938, when Japan seized Hainan Island and the Spratly Islands flanking the Philippines toward the North, even after Japan continued its direct intervention in the internal politics of the Philippine Commonwealth and established its strong fifth column jointly with the Franco Spaniards. It also continued to influence the State Department's orientation and activity even through 1940 when Japan subverted the Vichy government of Indo-China and established bases there; and to a certain extent even through 1941 when the military-fascists were bringing great pressure to bear upon the Dutch East Indies for war supplies and were strengthening their troops and bases in Indo-China and other strategic points; even after October, 1941, when General Tojo, leader of the extreme expansionist army clique, took over the Japanese Cabinet. In fact, down to December 7, 1941, when the "peace" conferences with the Japanese mission in Washington were rudely interrupted by the burst of bombs over Pearl Harbor and the Philippines, appeaser elements in the State Department were still active, exerted considerable influence on policy and succeeded in delaying necessary military preparation and concerted action by the United States and its allies to check and counteract in time Hitler's Far Eastern partner.

It cannot be argued even in weak defense that the aims of the Japanese military-fascists in Asia were a secret. They were fully explained

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the "blood-and-iron" Memorial of Premier Tanaka to the Emperor as early as 1927, and today no one is to be found who still claims that it is a forgery.* Events have too clearly authenticated this document, the first statement of the program for an "East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere," which since has been more fully developed both in theory and in practice.

The former appeasement policy followed jointly by Britain and the United States in the Far East made it possible for Japan to obtain 85 per cent of the war materials imported in 1937-1940 from the Anglo-American-Dutch bloc, which she is now attacking. It also resulted in granting only driblets of aid to China, whose war of liberation, now well advanced into its fifth year, constituted one of the major obstacles to the further advance of Japan's program for domination over the Far East. Furthermore, it led to a rejection of the policy of collective security against the fascist warmakers, which was consistently advocated by the Soviet Union and by progressive forces throughout the world.

Thus, the attack upon the Philippines and the Southwest Pacific did not begin on December 7, 1941. By that time, the policy of appeasement which dominated the relations of Great Britain and the United States with Japan up to the late autumn of 1941 had permitted Japan to take the preliminary measures of a strategic and political nature necessary for launching the new phase of armed aggression in the Pacific.

The policy of appeasement had its military complement. This was expressed in the vacillations and uncertainty with regard to the possibility of defending the Philippines and undertaking armed action in the Far East which characterized the thinking of certain top military and naval circles in the United States. In fact, the prevailing opinion in these circles was that it would be impossible to defend the Philippines from Japanese aggression. It was held that, should the United States be involved in war in the Pacific, we could fight only a delaying action in the Philippines, and would need to fall back upon the "natural" defense line of Alaska-Hawaii-Panama and from here conduct a long war of attrition. This tendency became stronger since 1939, when it became apparent that the United States would have to fight on both the Atlantic and the Pacific. It is noteworthy that the strongest opponents of the policy of withdrawal were President Manuel Quezon of the Philippine Commonwealth and General Douglas MacArthur, who was Quezon's Field Marshal and is now in command of the U.S.-Filipino army resisting the Japanese in Luzon.

The prevalence of this defeatist approach to the defense of the Philippines and long-range action in the Pacific reflected the narrow isolationist conception of the problem of national defense, which was fostered so systematically by the pro-fascist appeasers in the United States. For it was based on the conception of the United States

* See *Japanese Imperialism Exposed*, International Publishers, 1942.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alone—without allies—undertaking a war with Japan, at our own convenience and under conditions chosen by us. The more realistic opposing view was that despite difficulties of supply over the vast expanses between the West Coast and the Philippines—or rather because of this—it was necessary to base the defense of the Philippines and of the Far East as a whole upon united action between the United States, China, the U.S.S.R., Britain, Australia and the Dutch. Such an approach would make the base and the fortifications on Luzon an asset, and not a liability as claimed by the school of defeatists. For then the Manila base would become part of a whole defense square, together wih Hong Kong, Singapore, Surabaya and the Australian bases. Under such arrangements, the fortified outposts of Manila and Hong Kong would be backed up by a vast and resourceful hinterland, comprising the Indies, Malaya, Australia and even India on the one side, and China on the other. Only in this way could Japan's drive toward the South Seas be effectively and immediately blocked.

But the correctness of this approach, which required concerted action by the anti-fascist nations, was realized only under conditions of actual warfare, that is, when it was already too late to make all the necessary preparations under a joint command and with a common strategy for defeating the first Japanese attacks and immediately entering upon the offensive.

The tragic outcome of the ostrich-like military policy — growing out of appeasement and fed by the treasonous agitation of the America First "isolationists"—was felt first of all in Hawaii, which met Japan's total air and naval attack with total unpreparedness, as revealed by the President's Committee of Inquiry. The losses at Pearl Harbor also affected events in the Philippines, for it was evidently impossible for the Navy to rush support to MacArthur, or undertake parallel action elsewhere against Japan. The vacillating military policy left the Philippines unprepared to withstand an attack in force. In a speech broadcast to the United States at the end of November, while the U.S.-Japanese "peace" negotiations were proceeding in Washington, President Quezon called attention to the lack of adequate preparations for the defense of the Philippines, announced that his hands had been tied by the American authorities on the Islands for undertaking necessary civilian and military defense measures, and placed the responsibility for this state of affairs upon American policy.

It should be recalled that in the Independence Act, passed by the American Congress and approved by the Filipino people in 1935, our country had committed itself to guarantee the security and autonomy of the new Philippine Commonwealth which was established by that Act as a preliminary to complete independence in 1946. The United States undertook the responsibility to safeguard the Islands against attack, without at the same time providing the Commonwealth with the necessary resources, equip-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment and military training sufficient for an adequate Filipino armed force. The policy of appeasement formerly followed by the United States toward the Axis, and in this case particularly toward Japan, gave rise to those military policies which made it impossible adequately to fulfill the pledge to the Filipino nation and which therefore left the Islands unprepared.

Intertwined with the heritage of ten years of appeasement is the older heritage of colonial policy, which accounts for the serious mistakes made not only in resisting the actual invasion but in the period of preparation which preceded it as well. Continuation of the old colonial approach which governed the policy of some of the leading American governmental representatives in the Philippines was expressed in the failure fully to recognize and respect the autonomy of the Philippine Commonwealth Government, and the desire of the Filipinos themselves to participate fully on their own right in the preparations for the defense of their country.

Especially since 1937, when Japan launched the present phase of aggression against China and the Franco Spaniards were becoming more firmly entrenched among the native ruling political and economic circles, a great movement in support of collective security and for the maintenance and further development of friendly relations with the United States arose in the Philippines. This movement embraced all the labor and progressive circles, including the Communists, and came to influence in a democratic fashion the policy of the Commonwealth Government. The Communist Party especially, because of its great influence among the workers and peasants, was able to arouse the people to the dangers of Japanese aggression, to expose continuously the work of the fifth column, and to agitate effectively for the free participation of the Filipino government and people in the world front against the Axis as the only way to assure the security and independence of their country.

The people became generally aware of the danger to their homes and country and were ready to participate in all joint efforts with the United States to meet this danger.

What was needed in return was an appreciation by the American authorities of the stake and the role of the Filipino people in defeating aggression. That such an appreciation did not completely exist in the immediate period preceding the Japanese attack is shown in the conflict which raged between High Commissioner Sayre and President Quezon over questions involving the autonomous rights of the Commonwealth Government, the form of incorporation and participation of the Filipino troops in the American Command, the rights and duties of the Commonwealth Government in civilian defense, and other questions of a similar nature. It is clear that this type of conflict, arising primarily out of the shortsighted and narrow vision of certain of the American authorities, obstructed defense preparations and played into the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hands of the fifth columnists and the Axis invaders.

The accumulated economic heritage of the colonial policy also contributed heavily to the military defeats, and must now be seriously taken into account in planning further military action in this area. The retardation by certain American monopoly groups of the development of the national economy, particularly of heavy industry, has left the Islands without an indigenous war industry and makes them dependent for equipment upon what can be supplied over long and hazardous routes. To mention but one example: the Philippines possess all the natural resources necessary for the construction of an iron and steel industry and for the turning out of finished products—iron ore, coal, manganese, copper, chrome and other metals, as well as great electric power potentials. These resources are almost completely controlled by American interests, yet especially since 1938 increasing quantities of the strategic minerals have been shipped to Japan, while no important steps were taken to utilize these materials for the creation of a home defense industry.

III.

One of the main lessons that emerges from the Far Eastern theater of war is that the United Nations must undertake an effective and immediate mobilization of the colonial peoples to fight in defense of their own homes and land against Axis aggression. The immediate, and even the long range, prospect of turning the tide of battle in the far Pacific depends not only upon reinforcement of men and material but also upon the rapid involvement of the peoples of Asia in the joint war effort. In fact, this question no longer rests in the realm of theory, but has become a vital military necessity for the United Nations.

Mere superiority in productive power and resources of the United Nations over the Axis will not in itself produce victory. The existence of such superiority merely provides the basis upon which military victory can be organized. Everything depends upon the mobilization of the resources and the peoples, upon the enthusiastic support of the peoples for the just war, upon the actual utilization of resources and men in the most effective military manner. What is necessary for the waging of the indivisible, world-wide struggle against the Axis is unity of action of the anti-Axis nations, in accordance with a central, planned strategy, which will make use of pooled resources and armed forces in such a manner as to strike deadly blows at the focus of the Axis—Hitler Germany—while at the same time confronting the enemy on all wings of the world front with the power necessary to assure an indivisible victory. This requires, in the first place, the closest and fullest military alliance between the United States, the Soviet Union, England and China—the four leading powers of the United Nations.

The fact that world-wide coordination of all the anti-Axis forces, gathered around the joint leadership of the four principal

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers, is not yet fully developed remains one of the main reasons for continuing reverses in the South Pacific. Despite the important co-operative steps taken, as already indicated, there still persists a distribution of existing forces and resources very inadequately co-ordinated on a world scale, with the result that the disposal of the resources of the United Nations is still far from that which is required for coordinated concentration upon specified objectives. For instance, on the main world front, the front against Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union is carrying practically the entire load, and is doing it in so brilliant a manner as to open up the prospect of delivering the decisive blows to the Nazi army and Hitler Germany during 1942, especially if parallel offensive actions are undertaken by England and the United States in west or southern Europe. In the Far East, notwithstanding the requirements of the decisive Eastern Front, the Soviet Union is making a great contribution for victory in this theatre as well by continuing her supplies to China and by pinning down at least one-third of Japan's military power on the Siberian frontiers. With her weak resources, China is engaging directly at least 1,000,000 Japanese soldiers, while the combined strength in the South Pacific of Britain, the United States, the Dutch and the Australians—with additional direct help from China—is coping with an armed force which in all branches does not exceed 500,000 men.

In order to defeat Japan, and at the same time most rapidly to bring about the end of Hitler Germany, the main enemy, it is not necessary for the United Nations to concentrate their major forces in the Far East. To do so would play into the hands of Hitler, who hoped that the Japanese attack would result precisely in this diversion of forces from the main direction. Nor is it necessary, in order to bring about the defeat of Hitler, to leave the Far Pacific inadequately supplied and reinforced, fighting here only a delaying action and a war of attrition. This would lead to the entrenchment of Japan in the South Seas, strengthening the resources and striking power of the whole Axis, and opening up the possibility of offensives against the Soviet Union in Siberia, against India and Middle Asia, and against the Pacific side of the Western Hemisphere.

The problem which confronts the United Nations is to utilize their overwhelming superiority of resources and manpower in such a manner as to strike the main blow at Hitler Germany, while at the same time strengthening their stand against Japan and supplementing this with hitting at other decisive points. It is a problem of the full utilization of existing forces, and the allocation of these forces in accordance with a single global strategy. This requires not only a recognition of the vital role of the Soviet Union in the anti-Axis war, but concrete commitments and undertakings between the Anglo-American powers and the Soviet Union in joint military actions which would take into account the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paramount need for opening new anti-Hitler fronts in Europe, as well as whatever joint actions may be deemed necessary in the Far East and the Middle East. *It requires further that the three strongest powers of the anti-Hitler coalition—the United States, the U.S.S.R. and Britain—collaborate fully as equal partners, jointly sharing the responsibility for the direction of the global war, working in closest unison as the leaders of the world anti-Axis front.* If the Axis, whose total resources are inferior to those of the United Nations combined, can act with decision on far-flung battle-lines while concentrating their major forces against the Soviet Union, the anti-Axis bloc can operate even more effectively on all fronts, while concentrating their major power against Hitler.

In any case, the full utilization of existing resources, which would be greatly facilitated by a complete, all-around military alliance, need not wait upon the consummation of such an alliance. The waging of total war means maximum mobilization of all resources, and the fact remains that the vital forces of the Far East have hardly been touched. Lack of preparation in the South Pacific and continuing reverses are usually explained by the difficulties created by the tremendous spaces over which the battle is being fought and the long and hazardous routes stretching from 8,000 to 12,000 miles over which supplies and reinforcements must be delivered. These are undoubtedly important factors, which cannot be minimized in considering the problem of reinforcements and supplies. Nor can it be overlooked that the opening of new fronts in Europe and the Middle East will make it even more difficult to supply fully the South Pacific battlefields from Europe and America. It therefore becomes imperative to utilize fully the resources of Asia itself, to facilitate the mobilization of its peoples, to help arm and train them, and to draw them fully on their own right into the struggle against aggression.

The tremendous feat performed by China, with the active assistance and friendly collaboration of the U.S.S.R., in keeping Japan at bay for over four and one-half years is only beginning to be fully appreciated, as our own military reverses reveal the striking power of the Japanese war machine. The great role which China has played and can increasingly play in contributing to the defeat of Japan and the liberation of East Asia demands that all possible efforts be exerted to keep open the lines of supply to her and to increase greatly the flow of materials for her armies. It also requires that China be given her full recognition within the developing world alliance as well as in the Far Eastern United Commands, and that the troops which she has offered for the defense of Burma and other areas be gratefully accepted on the basis of equality with all other armed forces participating in the joint defense.

Above all, the successes which China has registered, fighting as a free and independent nation, drive home the importance of mobilizing the peoples of the Southwest Pa-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cific. If Japan is to be stopped, it is clear that the existing armies in the Straits area are insufficient, especially in view of Japan's temporary command of both the sea and the air. According to various press reports, the armed forces of the colonies involved, including all branches of the service and natives as well as troops from the homeland, at the beginning of hostilities in December were as follows: The Philippines, with a population of 16,000,000, have 80,000 troops; Malaya and Burma, population 18,000,000, army 100,000; Dutch East Indies, population 70,000,000, armed forces 125,000. On the other hand, Australia, with a population of only 7,000,000, already had 500,000 men mobilized, of which 250,000 were engaged in service outside Australia. (Data on armed forces from *Foreign Policy Reports*, January 1, 1942, "The United States at War," and *Foreign Policy Bulletin*, January 16, 1942.)

Reinforcements from the home armies, and especially planes and equipment, can and should be sent, but these are necessarily limited by distance and by the requirements on other fronts. But the peoples of these colonies can mobilize their own armies to participate jointly with the forces of the other nations, either for guerrilla action in the occupied regions or in regular army formations. If such a mobilization were carried out in the ratio of one for every twenty inhabitants (equivalent to the ratio employed in the United States for an army of 7,000,000, which is about half the ratio used in Germany and England) the following armed forces would be made available: Philippines, 800,000 men; Malaya and Burma, 900,000; Dutch East Indies, 3,500,000. This does not include the tremendous manpower which can be provided by China and India. By contrast, Australia has already achieved almost maximum mobilization, and at most could raise only another 200,000 men.

These figures supply merely a rough indication of the forces which can be mobilized, some for regular army formations, others for guerrilla bands, and still other for various forms of activity in the rear of the enemy. Even if sufficient equipment cannot be provided to supply such large military formations on the level of modern mechanized armies, China has shown how people's armies can stop the modern divisions of Japan and that even with inadequate quantities of modern arms it is possible to launch victorious offensives. Armies such as these, cooperating with mechanized land, aerial and naval forces of the United Nations, provide the basis upon which a coordinated offensive can be launched against Japan in the whole of Eastern Asia.

When British Ambassador Clarke Kerr left China at the end of January to take up his new post as Ambassador to the Soviet Union, the Communist Party organ at Chungking proposed a program for developing the offensive in the Far East, which it asked him to present to the British Government. According to the United Press, the following was proposed: (1) Heavy guns be rushed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to China over the Burma Road, while it was still open; (2) the millions of Chinese living throughout the Southwest Pacific area be mobilized for military service; (3) democratic rights to organize and arm be granted the native populations of the Far Pacific; (4) closer unity and cooperation between China, Britain and the Soviet Union; (5) services of guerrilla fighters in North China be accepted by the British High Command to help organize guerrilla warfare. This five-point program, arising from the most thorough experience in the mobilization of the people in the backward areas, embodies the essential steps for reversing the military situation in the Far East.

IV.

Successful military mobilization of the native populations of the Southwest Pacific likewise requires that those powers in the anti-Axis bloc with colonial possessions begin to develop a new approach to the subject peoples, which will take into account their aspirations for independence, for greater autonomy and democratic liberties, and for economic and social development.

Japan could take over Thailand virtually without a struggle because the ground had been well prepared in advance by military-fascist propaganda which demagogically utilized the anti-imperialist and deeply nationalist sentiments of the people. It was not only by arms, but by this type of propaganda as well, that the Japanese fifth column "softened" resistance in certain regions in the Philippines and Malaya. Millions of natives, particularly the working class, of these countries realized full well the unprecedented slavery they would suffer under Japanese domination—for they knew the story of Korea, of Manchuria and of the occupied portions of China. They recognize that the only road to independence today lies in the direction of bringing about the destruction of Hitlerism and the Axis, which constitutes the main threat to whatever liberties they have been able to achieve and to their prospect of obtaining even greater liberty and independence. But the peoples were not given the opportunity fully to participate, in their own right, together with the forces of the United Nations, in defending their land, with the result that the striking power and strength of the defending armies were greatly weakened and limited, and the fifth column was able to make certain headway in dividing and disorientating important sections of the people in some of the Far Eastern countries.

Naturally enough, next to the Soviet Union, whose fundamental solution of the national question, whose voluntary union of 180 nations and nationalities as free and independent nations, is one of the main factors accounting for its unity and strength, China was among the first of the United Nations to recognize the necessity of a new orientation toward the colonial peoples of the Far Pacific after December 7. Immediately after the opening of the new front the Communist Party of China called for a united front of the Siamese, Indians, Malayans, Filipinos, Koreans, For-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mosans and Chinese, declaring that "without such a united front of Oriental peoples against aggression, attacks on the Japanese in the Pacific will be ineffective." *(Sunday Worker,* January 2, 1942.) As the Japanese continued their advances toward the Southwest, a spokesman for the Chungking Government, speaking of the relation of the war in the Pacific to the global war against the Axis, also pointed out that "the battle of the Southwest Pacific is a battle for the freedom of the Asiatic peoples," and not merely for strategy and raw materials. *(New York Times,* January 14, 1942.)

Appreciation of the fact that the Filipino people are engaging in the struggle primarily to defend the democratic liberties they have already won, and that the aim of complete independence is the greatest inspiration for deepening and extending the struggle against the Japanese invaders, was shown by President Roosevelt in his message to the people of the Philippines on December 28, 1941. He said:

"I give to the people of the Philippines my solemn pledge that their freedom will be redeemed and their independence established and protected. The entire resources, in men and material, of the United States stand behind this pledge."

Because of our responsibility in leaving the Philippines inadequately prepared, our obligation is even greater to implement this pledge in concrete action. There could be no greater inspiration to the Filipino people in their unequal fight against the invader, and to all the peoples of the colonial world, than a recognition by the United States at this time, not only of its responsibility to realize independence in 1946 as already pledged, but of undertaking jointly with the Filipino people to fight for independence now as the immediate fruit of victory over the common foe. The United States would not only strengthen its own defenses but would set an inspiring example and make a great contribution to the mobilization of the colonial peoples if, without waiting for 1946, it were now to recognize the Philippine Commonwealth Federation, its government and people as an independent and sovereign nation and government, undertaking with it joint operations for the liberation of the Philippines, and welcoming it as an independent entity into the coalition of the United Nations. Such a step would be worth many divisions; the effectiveness of material help given in the form of trained men, equipment and the organization of guerrilla fighting would multiply itself a hundredfold if accompanied by a clear commitment of immediate independence.

The impact of the losses in Malaya, the imminent danger in which Australia finds itself, the invasion of Burma, the attacks upon the Dutch East Indies, whose strategic materials are needed on all fronts, and the dangerous exposure of India have aroused the whole British Empire to a searching examination of the traditional methods and approach of the British Colonial Office to the subject peoples. At no

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time since the failure of the Norwegian expedition and Dunkirk have the British people been more aroused, and today colonial policy is being widely debated in England. How deeply the question is being discussed is indicated by the angry comment of the London *Daily Express* after the loss of Penang, with its supplies of rubber and tin, that "the pack of whisky-swilling planters and military birds of passage" have forgotten that the Malayan population could have been mobilized against the Japanese. The *New Statesman* declares: "What threatens to destroy our empire in those regions is not merely that the men on the spot were second or third rate: it is that their contempt for brown and yellow skins unfitted them for realistic thinking and adequate action. This is obvious in Malaya because the news records our monotonous retreats. Is it really less obvious in India?" In Australia, now in extreme danger of invasion, the debate rages even more fiercely, with the Melbourne *Herald*, for instance, declaring that the weaknesses of the Pacific defenses were "due to faults of imperial strategy, bred of ignorance and prejudice." (*New York Times*, January 14, 1942.)

The tremendous strains of war have exposed the colonial system as one of the weakest links in the defenses of the majority of the United Nations. The continuation of the old policies jeopardizes the very national existence of Great Britain, the United States and their Dutch and Free French allies, whose fate is interlinked with the outcome of the war against the Axis. The experiences of the war in the Far East therefore confront the colonial powers with the necessity of evolving a new, democratic, progressive approach to the peoples of Asia. Some preliminary steps have been taken in this direction by the British: In Malaya, the release of Malayan and Chinese Communist and labor leaders (half the population is Chinese) led to the formation of a people's council for the mobilization of the population; but this action, as important as it is, came only after the Japanese had penetrated deeply into the Peninsula and too late to be immediately effective. In India, hundreds of leaders of the National Congress were released. However, although Nehru has made it clear that the defeat of the Axis is a prerequisite for freedom, the British have not yet agreed to consider a progressive revision of India's status.

General recognition to the principle of the right of self-determination was given by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in the first three points of the Atlantic Charter. Here they repudiated all territorial aggrandizement and declared (Point 3) that "they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." Later, explaining the significance of the Charter to Parliament, Churchill made it clear that it was the intent of Point 3 to lay down a policy only for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"states and nations now under the Nazi yoke" and that peoples who "owe allegiance to the British Crown are a separate matter entirely." However, since August, 1941, when the Charter was issued, the spread of the war into the Pacific has brought the most important colonial regions within the orbit of warfare and has raised the necessity for the colonial powers within the United Nations to re-define their position toward the subject peoples in this area. The principles set forth in the first three points of the Atlantic Charter provide a basis for an approach to this question which will assure successful mobilization of the native peoples against the Axis invaders.

With respect to those areas which have fallen under the yoke of Japan, it is clear that the native populations can best be won for a joint struggle against the invaders, not with the aim of restoring a previous condition of dependence, but with the objective of effectively advancing, if not immediately establishing, their right of self-determination. As regards the older conquests of Japan, this would mean that the United Nations make it clear that they desire no territorial aggrandizement as the result of victory, and that the joint defeat of the Axis would assure recognition of a completely independent Korea and Formosa, and the restoration of Manchuria and all occupied areas of China to a unified China. By the same principle, complete guarantees of the independent status of Thailand should be assured by the United Nations. A great stimulus would also be given to the mobilization of the peoples if it were frankly recognized that authority in Indo-China no longer rests in Vichy but has been taken over completely by the Japanese military-fascists and, as a consequence, the peoples of this region can best be armed and mobilized on the basis of establishing their own autonomy independent of Vichy and Japan alike.

Malaya and the Philippines present still another aspect of the problem. These are the only two areas dominated or deeply penetrated by Japan which were dependencies of powers in the United Nations. The policy developed with regard to the Philippines and Malaya will therefore have a profound effect not only upon the mobilization of these peoples but of the native populations of the whole Southwest Pacific. The fulfilment of the American pledge to help secure the independence of the Philippines, especially if this is followed by concrete steps to involve the Commonwealth Government directly into the Supreme Command of the Southwest Pacific, to welcome its adherence as an autonomous government to the Pact of the United Nations, and, still better, to recognize now an independent and sovereign Philippine Republican government as an ally in the anti-Axis war, will serve as a great stimulus, as well as a model to the colonial peoples. There can be no doubt that an approach along these lines to Malaya by the British Government and people, involving the recognition of the national rights of the population of Malaya, would be the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most immediately effective basis upon which the people will cooperate fully with the United Nations in driving out the Axis invader and his native puppets. An important and basic step in this direction would be for the United Nations to undertake jointly with responsible leaders of the population of Malaya the organization of guerrilla warfare and various forms of resistance to the invader looking toward a common struggle for liberation.

With respect to the great colonial areas which are now defending themselves or are preparing their defenses against attack, the present security and the future independence of the native peoples can likewise best be served by close cooperation with the United Nations. The situation, especially in Burma, the Dutch East Indies and India, requires that concrete steps be taken to draw the native populations into the joint war effort through greater autonomy and self-rule, involving a full recognition of the great role which these peoples are capable of playing in defeating the Axis in the Pacific and Middle Eastern areas. Full military mobilization of the Burmese people, recognition of their autonomous rights in preparing and participating in the military and civilian defense of their country, inclusion of their representatives in the military and political councils, participation of the people's organizations in mobilizing the country for defense, undertaking discussions on the present and future status of Burma—this is vital for the defense of Burma, of the decisive Burma Road to China and of India, and for hastening the victory of the United Nations against the Axis as a whole. Such an approach, not only to Burma, but to the Dutch East Indies as well, is in accord with the best interests of the peoples, not only in these colonies but in the metropolitan countries as well.

The British Government and people are in a position to make a great contribution to the whole anti-Axis front by transforming India into a real bastion of the United Nations in the Far Pacific and the Middle East. Of all the colonial nations, India has the greatest resources of manpower and materials, and its iron and steel industry is capable of rapid expansion. In 1939, India turned out over 3,000,000 tons of iron and steel, including 1,600,000 tons of pig iron of which about 600,000 tons were exported. In addition, it already has important coal, cement, paper, wool and textile, and shipbuilding industries. In view of India's strategic location, both with regard to the Southwest Pacific and the Middle East, it can serve as a nearby and key arsenal to a vast sector of the world front. But this requires the fullest stimulation of India's war industries, accompanied by the recognition of the rights and liberties of its working class and its people, and by steps to satisfy the legitimate demands of the National Congress for greater autonomy for India within the cooperative war effort of the United Nations. It is a mark of great statesmanship that the leaders of India's nationalist movement do not place the demand for independence as a condition for participation in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world anti-Axis war, for they realize that the possibilities of independence would be destroyed by an Axis victory. And it would constitute an equal degree of statesmanship if the British Government, also acting in its best national interests, would give concrete recognition to and promote India's aspirations for freedom.

Measures such as these, which are of a limited nature, are necessary for strengthening the defense of the Far East, to assure with the least sacrifice and within the briefest space of time the defeat of the Axis as a whole. The chief opposition to such a policy comes from those among circles with the greatest vested interests in the colonial areas, such as the British Munichmen and opponents of Churchill's war policies who publicly dared to denounce a scorced-earth policy for Malaya in the vain hope of preserving their rubber and tin holdings. The experiences with Hitler in Europe and Japan in Asia should have made it plain to these gentlement that their holdings are treated as the spoils of victory, and that even from their own narrow class viewpoint greater liberties for the native peoples is indeed a small price to pay for the rights of ownership and the utilization of these valuable resources by the United Nations.

Clearly, one of the great lessons emerging from the Pacific theater of war is that the successful waging of an indivisible war on all fronts requires the mobilization of the peoples of the colonial world for full participation in the struggle. This now has acquired the urgency of military necessity. For this mobilization to be successful, it is necessary for the United Nations to draw the native populations into active struggle against the Axis and to adopt a progressive approach to these peoples, taking fully into account their democratic and nationalist aspirations. The deepening and broadening of the Atlantic Charter, with concrete application to the subject peoples of the United Nations, will affect the course of the whole war, contributing directly to the defeat of Hitler and the Axis. It will also facilitate the further consolidation of the world anti-Axis front, the closer collaboration of the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain and China, the adhesion to the United Nations of all free peoples fighting under a unified world strategy for victory, for destruction of the fascist tyranny, for national freedom, for a just peace.

The labor and progressive forces, including the Communists, in the United States, as in Great Britain, have a great role to play in helping bring about the progressive reorientation of our country's policy toward the subject peoples in accord with the progressive, general anti-Hitler and anti-Axis policy of the Roosevelt Government. Events have made the colonial question a central problem of the war and of mobilization for victory. It is therefore necessary that among the American people, particularly among labor and progressive circles a keen understanding of the question be developed. Labor and progressives can make a great contribution to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mobilization of the colonial peoples for joint struggle against the Axis by establishing and developing the closest bonds of solidarity with the peoples of the Far East, by winning the battle for production at home so that adequate supplies can be sent into the Far Pacific while adequately equipping ourselves and fully supplying the main and decisive fronts in Europe, by striving for a full-fledged military and political alliance between the leading powers of the anti-Axis bloc so that a unified and central leadership can be provided the nation fighting for liberation, thus facilitating the mobilization of all the peoples for victory over the common enemy: Hitler and Hitlerism, the Berlin-Tokyo-Rome Axis.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LET FREEDOM RING FOR EARL BROWDER

BY CARL ROSS

(Based on a report to an enlarged meeting of the National Council of the Young Communist League, held in New York on January 31, 1942)

A GREAT American warned his people a few years ago that "*a continuation of isolationist policies by the United States will surely convince the arrogant militarists of Tokyo that now is the time for them to take over the Philippines, Hawaii, Guam and Alaska.*"

Bursting bombs upon Pearl Harbor nearly four years later drove home that bitter truth to America more keenly than could any words.

But what a heavy price we had to pay for the isolationist illusions that numbed the senses of so many to the grave peril. How much easier and less costly it would have been to heed the advice of this American who saw so far-sightedly and clearly.

Had the United States taken that warning to heart there would have been no "Pearl Harbor" on that infamous December morning!

A month later this same American visited Republican Spain, to meet that band of gallant American boys in the Abraham Lincoln Battalion who were fighting with the Spanish people against Hitler, Mussolini and Franco. Again in ringing words that should have burned deep into the conscience of the American people, he told us:

"When I arrived in Barcelona last week, I visited many of the thirty-five apartment houses blown to bits by high-power bombs from Italian planes, dropped the day before, a sunny Sunday morning. I saw dismembered and mutilated babies and mothers being removed from the wreckage. In my mind rose the question, how long will it be before similar bombs drop on New York, Chicago, San Francisco, with similar results 'at home' to our women and children—perhaps to my own family too? . . .

"What reason have we to assume that America is immune to this madness that is sweeping the world?"

In those days when Spain was fighting for its life against tremendous odds, the average American was not yet convinced that the bombs falling on Madrid and Barcelona were also aimed at us. But how prophetic this warning has proved to be that Spain was a stepping stone for the Axis bandits on their way toward world conquest! If they had not defeated the Spanish peo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ple they would not today be able to send their submarines to lurk off the U. S. coast to sink our ships. They would not threaten our very existence as a free nation.

The man who spoke these warnings in the days before Chamberlain flew to Hitler's hide-out in Berchtesgaden to sell out our peace proposed, even then, that America join with Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China and all other freedom-loving nations in a "united nations" agreement to save peace by smashing fascism. Then it would have been relatively easy to crush the Axis merely by effective aid to the people of Spain and China. Now to do the job will take millions of men and tens of thousands of tanks, planes and guns, and the American people are thankful that they *have* staunch allies in the other "United Nations."

Surely America should now seek out the man who showed such wisdom and foresight, and recognize the greatness of his service. Usually signal honors are showered upon those who serve our country so well. Only a few weeks ago the memory of a man named Billy Mitchell, who prophesied, in the face of ridicule, that America would need a great air fleet in its defense, was rescued from obscurity and disgrace and, even after his death, a Distinguished Service Medal was bestowed upon him. *Is this other great American less deserving of praise and honor?*

That cogent warning to beware of Pearl Harbor was uttered not once, but a hundred times. It was spoken throughout the length and breadth of the land by a man who for nearly a year has been locked behind the grim, gray walls of Atlanta penitentiary! His name is *Earl Browder.* He is an American of proven loyalty, anxious to serve his country in this hour of crisis. Our country needs such men of vision and courage today. Can we afford to do without his talent and ability? Isn't it necessary that he be free to help win the war against the fascist barbarians?

The patriotic people and youth of America can have only one answer to the question of whether Browder should be free. That answer is: *"If it will help America—let it be done!"*

Facts of the Case

Maybe there is a good reason for keeping him locked up? Let us briefly examine the facts of the case. Earl Browder, leader of the Communist Party, and twice the candidate of his party for the Presidency of the United States, was sentenced to prison for a term of four years and to pay a fine of $2,000 for a minor technical passport violation. The usual sentence in such case is more nearly thirty days or a suspended sentence. Is he an alien not entitled to use an American passport? Of course not; he is a native-born son of the state of Kansas. Did he use a passport improperly or in a manner harmful to his fellow citizens? No. Not even the prosecuting attorney charged that any criminal intent was involved. Actually Earl Browder was *convicted for a technical error in filling out an applica-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion blank for a passport which he then received with the full knowledge of the proper officials in his own name, under no false pretences, and used in a perfectly legal manner to travel abroad on such missions as his visit to Spain!

Actually, even if he had been guilty, Earl Browder would already have served an unnecessarily long and harsh sentence. The spirit of justice and fair play alone, if not the firm belief that Browder is indispensable to our nation in these war times, would call for his freedom. Only one individual, President Roosevelt, can now free Earl Browder. But it *is* within the power of the *millions* of American citizens to persuade the President that this *must* be done! Over 2,000,000 people have already urged the President to do so, but a few individuals, Representative Martin Dies among them, are most violently opposed. In fact, he boasts no little of having had a major part in instigating the conviction and jailing of Earl Browder. Most Americans have learned to view with suspicion anything that the notorious poll-tax Congressman favors. In the Browder case such suspicion is justified, for by now it is commonly accepted that Browder has been jailed because of his political views and *not* because of any "crime."

A Democratic Position

There is nothing alien or un-American in the effort to see that justice is done to individuals persecuted for their political opinions. The effort to free Browder is based upon a tradition as old as these United States and is written into the basic law of the land in the Bill of Rights of the Constitution! Thomas Jefferson could rightfully lay claim to being the founder of this tradition and to the title of being the first defender of political prisoners in this nation. We can learn something of *why* and *how* to free Browder from the case of Matthew Lyon, a political prisoner of Jefferson's day. Lyon, a member of Congress from Vermont during the Adams Administration, was considered a rabid Jeffersonian Democrat, which term, in the eyes of Mr. Dies' political forebears, was synonymous with the present-day term "Communist."

The policies of the Adams Administration, manipulated by the arch-reactionary Alexander Hamilton, were bitterly opposed by Jefferson and his followers, who were rousing the nation to continue the fight for democracy and independence. Foreign policy became a central issue then as now. Jefferson, who saw the continued menace to American freedom from British tyranny, favored a firm policy of friendship and collaboration with the young French Republic in the interests of their mutual security. Consequently, from one end of the country to the other the Jeffersonians were denounced as "foreign agents" or Jacobins, and a reign of terror was let loose against them by the enactment of the notorious Alien and Sedition Acts.

Matthew Lyon established his own newspaper to support Jefferson, and thus became a logical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

choice to be singled out as the first victim under the new "sedition" act. Finding a charge upon which to convict him was by no means easy. But a flimsy technical pretext was discovered. Lyon had published articles criticizing the Adams Administration *before* the "Sedition Act" had even been passed by Congress! On this "charge" of violating the Act he was, however, arrested and sentenced to four months in prison and to pay a fine of $1,000 in a trial described by one historian as a "farce"!

The citizens of Vermont, and the Green Mountain Boys who had fought with Lyon in the Revolution of '76, protested and thousands signed petitions to President Adams. The people nominated this "convict" for Congress and re-elected him with twice as many votes as his nearest opponent!

When his term of imprisonment was about to expire, the fine of $1,000 (an enormous sum those days) had not been raised by the poor Vermont farmers. The Adams Administration threatened to keep him in prison, but the eyes of the entire nation were now focused upon the case of the man in that little prison cell. Jefferson, Madison and their friends raised and paid the necessary money to free Lyon.

Lyon was freed by the personal intervention of Jefferson, who utilized the persecution of Lyon and others to rally the people in the fight for democracy.

Browder's Policy Vindicated

The case of Earl Browder is no less a political matter than the case of Matthew Lyon. Nor is the pretext upon which he was sentenced to prison any less flimsy. In the eyes of the appeasers, and the infamous Dies Committee, Earl Browder has been guilty of one particularly unforgivable "crime"—he has dared to advocate as the course of action for the U.S. in the interests of American national security, a policy of friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union.

That may appear to be a "crime" in their eyes; but is there anyone in American public life, except friends of Hitler, willing to say now that the U.S. should not cooperate with the Soviet Union? If there were they would not find support among the American people. The people have learned all too well that it was during our long complicity in the appeasement policy of hostility toward the Soviet Union and concessions to Hitler that the Axis powers seized the vantage points from which they menace us today.

Contrast the debacle of that period to the present day, when our nation is firmly allied with the Soviet Union, with Great Britain and China. From the day that alliance came into being the possibility has been assured that by an aggressive and vigorous conduct of the war the United Nations can march forward to glorious victories aaginst the common foe of all mankind. And this was the policy that Browder advocated, for which he was attacked as a *"foreign agent."* If only more Americans had been guilty of such "crimes"!

The fact is that the policy Earl Browder so long advocated is the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

counterpart of Jefferson's foreign policy, both when he served as Secretary of State under President Washington and during the Adams Administration. At that time the young American Republic, which "kindled the flame" that resulted in the Great French Revolution of 1789, was not yet secure in its independence from British tyranny. The British Tories openly proclaimed their intention of crushing the new concept of the "Rights of Man" that had been born in America and France. Against this mortal peril that could have defeated either of the two nations alone, only friendship and collaboration could assure their mutual security. In the United States, Alexander Hamilton and other "appeasers" of the British King were prepared to betray both France and America through a treacherous alliance with reactionary Britain for war against the French Republic. Thomas Jefferson, aided by his friend Tom Paine who inspired America to aid the French cause in his famous pamphlet *The Rights of Man*, waged a bitter and successful struggle against betrayal of our sister Republic. During the last decade of the 18th century Jefferson urged vigorous measures to support revolutionary France, such as an embargo on England in order also to protect American interests. The will of the people prevailed. Jefferson's battle to prevent the United States from becoming a partner in crime of the reactionary British Tories and against the infamous Alien and Sedition Acts ended in his election as President.

Just as the Jeffersonian policy of friendship with revolutionary France aided in defending the independence of America, the policy which Earl Browder advocated so long and eloquently, of alliance between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., as an integral part of a "united nations" pact against the fascist Axis, has proved to be the only means of defending our independence today. And as the policy of Jefferson was vindicated by the people in his election to the Presidency, so also has the policy of Browder been vindicated. It is today the official policy of our government and of every patriotic American citizen.

Red-Baiting Exposed

If this had been his only contribution to our nation Earl Browder would still deserve a place among those needed to win victory. This is no time to deprive our nation of the service of such a man. National unity will be harmed by keeping a staunch anti-fascist defender of the country in prison. Browder was put in prison primarily by the efforts of those who opposed the alliance with the Soviet Union upon which our very life depends. What a victory for the appeaser enemies of our country! Every day that Browder remains in prison is aid and comfort to the Hitler fifth column that even today tries to drive a wedge between us and our allies!

As a testimonial to that fact, growing numbers of citizens in all walks of life are urging the President to free him.

Much to the dismay of the appeasers and to those who kowtow to them, the rising wave of protest

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the unjust imprisonment of Earl Browder is gaining momentum day by day. This was begrudgingly admitted recently by the New York *World-Telegram* and the *Daily Mirror* when these papers broke their long conspiracy of silence about the Free Browder Campaign. They revealed that the day of the President's birthday ball, the White House was "flooded with messages urging the immediate release of Earl Browder" and that "tens of thousands of individual telegrams and hundreds of thousands of postcards" would go to the White House. They obligingly listed a few of the prominent citizens who advocated freeing Browder, acknowledging them to be "non-Communists." Among those the *World-Telegram* named were "former Republican Senator George Wharton Pepper, the Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Episcopal Bishop Edward L. Parsons, Dr. A. A. Brill, honorary chairman of the American Psychoanalytic Association, the head of the Missouri State Grange, the President of the Yonkers Board of Education, James T. Shotwell, president of the League of Nations Association" and other illustrious names among whom not the least well known is Tom Mooney.

And then, proving that the day of miracles is not past, these same newspapers conclude that this is nothing more than a "red plot" in which these respectable citizens were somehow inveigled under a false pretext! Surely not even they have the colossal nerve to claim that these indivduals who signed petitions to free Earl Browder do not *know* that he is a Communist!

What is it that has produced this absurd idea? Obviously the appeasers are deeply disturbed by the fact that millions recognize the injustice done to Browder as a severe blow against the rights of the people. Instead of concluding from this that the people's will should be done, they attempt to stop the drive for Browder's release by creating the impression that only the "reds" are concerned.

Appeasement Jitters

There is ample reason here for a case of "appeasement jitters." It proves that the principal weapon employed by the Hitler fifth column to divide the people has been blunted. If millions are no longer willing to be bullied and bludgeoned into confusion by the cry of "red" raised against Browder, then the honeymoon days of Martin Dies' wooing of Adolf Hitler are numbered! Hitler and his fifth column who divided and conquered Europe with the propaganda of anti-Communism won't be able to divide and conquer America with the same trick.

Of course, it would be a strange situation if the Communists were not among the most active in working for Earl Browder's release!

We declare the release of Earl Browder to be an objective inseparable from the object of winning the war for which we are ready to give every ounce of our energy and every drop of our blood. And we say to every American that a successful campaign to free Earl Browder will help to end the day when patriotic trade union leaders, liber-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

als, progressives and youth leaders are expected to cringe before the fifth-column cry of "red." That title of "red" that the Hitler agents wish to use as a brand of shame against whomever they fear can become a badge of honor to single out devoted and loyal defenders of America! It is for this reason that every honest anti-fascist must defend the right of *all*, irrespective of their political opinions, including the Communists, to contribute their share to the national unity for the defeat of the Axis powers. This is no selfish concern of Communists. It is a problem to be faced by everyone who wants an end to all efforts disrupting and confusing the people's unity with false issues.

Above all, the freeing of Earl Browder is of concern to American organized labor. The demand for the release of Browder on the part of over 500 local and central labor bodies of both C.I.O. and A. F. of L., and by leading officials of international unions, is an event of first-rate magnitude. It represents a growing recognition on the part of the trade unions, especially by the progressives and Left wing of the C.I.O., which are playing an increasingly important role, that Earl Browder is a leader of the working class, the leader of a working class political party, and that his imprisonment is an attack upon labor and the concern of labor. It is of the utmost importance to our nation and to the cause of national unity to wipe out all tendencies toward concessions to the baitings by pro-Hitler groups, such as the imprisonment of Earl Browder represents.

Here is a cause that will appeal to the best that is in the youth of America, their deep sense of justice, loyalty and fair play. It is the fight to free a man who can justly be called the friend and champion of youth. Among political figures in American life there are many who lay claim to this title, but none with so clear a claim as Earl Browder. Ours is a generation that admires figthing champions built in the mold of Joe Louis. We need champions who can step in and deliver hard, fast blows against the biggest opponent we've ever been up against, the fascist Axis! This fight is for keeps, and the stake is our lives, our happiness, our future, everything that we are and ever hope to be! We need this man, Earl Browder, on our side!

Many young people and youth organizations have already raised their voices for the freedom of Earl Browder. But they are all too few compared to the millions who are springing to arms at their nation's call, who are manning the tanks, guns, planes, production lines and civilian defense tasks. If they are not greater in number it can *only* be because the millions have not yet learned to appreciate that this too is a task of winning the war! Once that realization dawns upon them, they will as loyally rise to the defense of Browder as they do to smash the enemy attacks in the far-off hills of the Philippines!

The sage advice, patient understanding and outstanding example of Earl Browder have given America many outstanding heroes of the battle for freedom. There is Dave

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Doran, seaman, young Communist, who gave his young life on the fields of Spain so that we might have more time to gird ourselves to take up the same battle. Others went to Spain, too, young men who learned from Browder how to value human freedom sufficiently to risk their lives gladly that it might live. There were Lieutenant-Colonel John Gates and Captain Bob Thompson of the Spanish Republican Army who today proudly serve the Stars and Stripes as privates in the U.S. Army. A host of others, taught in the spirit of Browder by the Young Communist League, serve their country and flag wherever duty calls, and others but await the call to duty.

The youth of this country have a proud tradition to uphold in the fight for justice. One case stands out above others. The youth movement played no small part in snatching Angelo Herndon from the jaws of death on a Georgia chain-gang by a great protest movement. In this movement, which reached far into the ranks of the organized youth, a splendid tradition was established of defending the rights of Communists irrespective of agreement with their political opinion. Such a tradition coupled with the knowledge that in the case of Browder there is in addition at stake the great, all-meaning issue of the needs of national unity for the defense of our country's existence, should help to make the name of Earl Browder a symbol among the youth, synonymous with the fight for democracy and liberty.

Enlist for the Campaign

This campaign for the freedom of Earl Browder is conducted in the spirit of Jefferson. The decision of such an eminent citizen as Wendell Willkie to act as defense attorney in the case of William Schneiderman, well-known Communist whose citizenship the prosecution wishes to revoke on that ground, reflects the growing appreciation of the need to recognize Communists as part of the national unity. In these factors are guarantees of success for the effort to free Browder if it is conducted aggressively and vigorously.

Enlistment for the campaign is open for the duration—until Browder walks out of prison into the sunlight to join his people again!

Duty consists of adding your voice and the voice of your friends, shopmates, school chums, of your organization, union, club, church to the growing roll of Americans who believe that *everything*, everything including Earl Browder, must be given to the defense of our nation!

The task is to send telegrams, letters, resolutions to President Roosevelt urging that he grant an order of Executive clemency freeing Earl Browder. March 25 will mark one year since the unjust jailing of Browder. The American people cannot allow the injustice to Earl Browder and to themselves to be prolonged. Let America ring out with the words *Free Earl Browder*, especially on these days dedicated to the cause of human freedom on which we commemorate the birthdays of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglass.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRODUCTION FOR VICTORY

BY BRUCE MINTON

IN HIS message to Congress on the State of the Union, President Roosevelt said: "Let no man say it cannot be done. It must be done—and we have undertaken to do it." Sixty thousand planes in 1942, 125,000 planes in 1943, 45,000 tanks in 1942, 75,000 tanks in 1943, 20,000 anti-aircraft guns in 1942, 35,000 of the same in 1943, 8,000,000 tons of merchant shipping in 1942, 10,000,000 tons of the same in 1943—this is the program. These are the highlights of the Victory Production Program. And the country is saying, together with the President: It must be done! It can be done! We have undertaken to do it! This is the nation's motto in war production. It is the motto of the labor movement, which is mobilizing everything for the national war effort.

The question naturally arises how to realize this production program, how to mobilize the nation's industrial resources for the war effort. This is the common problem of the government, of Congress, of labor, industry and agriculture, of all the people.

Certain circles in Congress, as well as in some large corporations, seem to be "skeptical." But the American people by their actions can prove such "skepticism" groundless. They can exercise persuasion and pressure upon those elements that let their "skepticism" interfere with the successful prosecution of the war production program.

It is characteristic that one of the "skeptics" in Congress should be Hamilton Fish. Of course, nobody would seriously think that this particular Congressman has any special competence, economic or technical, for judging our industrial capacities. His judgment, therefore, must be considered mainly "political"; that is, he is far from being in sympathy with the nation's war of liberation against Hitlerism because his political attitudes lean definitely toward pro-Hitler appeasement. This is not to say that every "skeptic" belongs to this category, but that every pro-Hitler appeaser will now seek to hide himself behind "skepticism," and that "skepticism" as such objectively helps Hitler and Japan.

Our war production program is fully realistic and practical because it is based upon these three fundamental propositions: adequate raw material resources; practically unlimited actual and potential productive capacities; and our people's enthusiasm, faith and determination.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These three put together can do wonders; and of the three, the determination of labor and the masses of our people to see the thing through is most decisive. Hence, any attempt to dampen this spirit by "skepticism," and any effort to exclude the working class from making its full contribution to the realization of the war production program, inevitably works against our nation and in favor of the enemy.

Let us take the problem of production—a basic production problem is that of conversion. America's vast and intricate plant must be shifted without delay from the manufacture of pleasure cars and washing machines, refrigerators and all the other peacetime products and gadgets, to the output of the sinews of war—tanks, planes, ships, munitions, guns. The complexity of this conversion process is admittedly great. The strain of fully transforming American economy from peace to war is indeed formidable, but imperative if this nation is speedily to become the arsenal of democracy, able to supply not only its own armed forces, but to render decisive aid to the British, Soviet, Chinese, Dutch and other allies. The change cannot be realized by any half-hearted approach, nor is it possible if the leisurely pace of the past is maintained, a pace which would necessitate literally years to achieve the desired peak of production.

In the sphere of plane production the original plan, prior to December 7, called for 50,000 planes by the end of 1942, and all aviation authorities agreed that it was perfectly realizable. Actual production figures last September were 1,914 planes a month, which was twice the rate for last February. But the main thing to remember, in connection with these figures, is that our full capacity for plane production has not yet been tapped. Our chief source of capacity for plane production—the automobile industry—was still employed chiefly for making cars and trucks for civilian use. And yet we were already producing, last September, at the rate of nearly 24,000 planes a year, proving our ability to double the rate of production between February and September.

Now the plan is to put the automobile industry *entirely* to war production and to have the industry *pool and combine its capacities* for that purpose. There can be no doubt that, by doing so, we shall turn out the 60,000 planes in 1942, and the 125,000 planes in 1943. All technical experts as well as labor are fully agreed on that. Yet certain influential heads of large corporations are still not fully convinced. Why?

C. E. Wilson, president of the General Motors Corp., recently said that the industry "will do the best it can"; but "he did not appear optimistic that it could reach the 5 billion war production goal in 1942. He said retooling of plants in some instances would take a year" (N. Y. *Times*, January 6). But the plans of the automobile workers' union have demonstrated that it can be done, and government experts are of the same opinion. Where is the source of difference? Mr. Wilson evidently tends to want to continue "business as usual," and it is a matter of fact

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that most of the automobile industry has not yet retooled for war needs. Leaders of the industry bargained with the government to permit the manufacture of 204,848 cars in January and, with that concession granted, are trying to extend this limit far into the future. And in January of this year the fact remained that the automobile industry, where over half the country's machine tools are concentrated, had not yet drawn blueprints for conversion!

Even when it became clear that the industry must either shift to the manufacture of tanks and other war materials, or cease to operate, the delay was costly. Giant plants began to shut down. Within a month after the conference of the industry on war production, it was anticipated that over 400,000 workers, the most skilled in mass-production methods, would be without jobs—at a time when the President called for the continuous operation of plants, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. No provisions had been made for the retraining of these workers forced into idleness. And along with those losing jobs in factories, thousands in the service and consumers industries, thousands in white collar occupations were put out of work. Conversion would meanwhile proceed at its snail-like pace, if at all. Only when the new plants came into production—a matter of six months to a year—only if and when conversion occurred—a matter of at least a year at the pace pursued—would the available workers be utilized to supply American armed forces with desperately needed equipment. Evidently America's allies were expected to wait. Evidently, the enemy also was expected to wait—or otherwise the lives of American boys would be sacrificed vainly and criminally because they lacked the machinery with which to defend themselves. There could be no talk of victory for months hence when America creakingly got around to producing weapons without which the armed forces were helpless.

But labor had a solution to propose. The United Automobile Workers of the C.I.O. proposed to combine the productive facilities of every company in the industry, especially its machine and tool-making facilities, *operating the industry as a single unit for war production,* and drawing into it the facilities of all available smaller plants in the country. This is first. And second: to establish effective collaboration between labor and management and government through industry councils, to organize and carry through the government's assignment for the industry. This is a plan for war production and for winning the war.

On all sides the labor movement showed a mounting awareness of its very great stake in the war, and came forward as the champion of the nation. It realized that fascism was the most immediate and merciless enemy, and that all effort must be concentrated toward smashing the Axis. Clearly, such a resolve must be given content by winning the maximum production of necessary raw materials and war equip-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. American labor responded unhesitatingly. And because nothing could be allowed to interfere with the all-important task of obtaining production, labor voluntarily laid aside the strike weapon "for the duration," and put an end to jurisdictional disputes. A. F. of L. and C.I.O. alike pledged themselves to keep mines, mills and shops humming at maximum capacity. The two camps of labor, previously at odds, sought ways of cooperating to spur the prosecution of the war.

In further contribution, labor used its close knowledge of industry and equipment to offer concrete proposals on how to obtain the speediest fulfillment of war requirements. Philip Murray of the C.I.O. offered a plan for industry-management organization which would mobilize the full energies of both management and labor. But the Murray Plan was carefully filed away in the pigeonhole reserved at O.P.M. headquarters for constructive suggestions. In the same way the Reuther Plan for the automobile industry; the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers Union plan for copper, zinc and lead; the Bridges Plan for loading and unloading ships in port; the steel workers' plan; the agricultural implement workers' plan—all the numerous blueprints for production and conversion—were consistently ignored.

The business-as-usual forces turned a deaf ear. In not one instance could any objection be found to labor's plans because of "impracticability." Still the monopoly obstructionists balked. Refusing to countenance the pooling of facilities, which would have meant a planned beginning of the difficult shift to war production, they raised the old meaningless cry of "regimentation" and "socialization." Their answer was "to divide the responsibility for management would be to destroy the very foundation upon which America's unparalleled record of industrial accomplishment has been built" (N. Y. *Times*, January 8). But, far from destroying industrial accomplishment, such plans, if effectively carried out, will release and vastly stimulate initiative on all sides.

Labor, together with all national forces of the country, is determined that the United Nations shall win the war and destroy Hitlerism. This demands that industry, and the entire national economy, be turned into one unit for war production. This demands that labor's initiative, abilities and enthusiasm be fully utilized. This demands close and harmonious collaboration in production between management, labor and government. And this is what labor proposes. What this may result in, as we go along, is a development *in the direction of* a certain kind of war state capitalism with democratic controls, which is not "socialization" at all, but the adaptation of capitalist economy to national war purposes.

The position to date of Mr. Wilson, president of General Motors, is disturbing. It is disturbing because Mr. Wilson's "skepticism" is shared by quite a few influential people in the large corporations. It is also shared by many business publications which generally reflect the at-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

titudes of big executives. For example: as late as the first week in January, when it was already known that the President was going to propose a $50,000,000,000 war expenditure for 1942, *Business Week* was doubtful whether we could reach even the level of $40,000,000,000 in the current year. Of course, all of this is generally accompanied with the assurance that "we shall do the best," but the spirit for doing the best is not much in evidence.

Thus the problem is still with us—the problem of overcoming the attitudes of "business as usual" and the spirit of "skepticism" that are so marked among many of the heads of large corporations. It is the problem of preventing political attitudes of pro-Hitler appeasement from interfering with our war production program and with the conduct of the war generally.

In reality, the methods of the business-as-usual forces—in which O.P.M. Director Knudsen and his like-minded followers were supreme—wanted to utilize the struggle against fascism in order to pile up colossal profits for certain big monopolists and starve out the small ones. They gobbled up contracts and their spokesmen at Washington saw to it that the contracts were fed to them. Sub-contracts were refused; the full productive capacity of the nation remained outside the war effort. The O.P.M. announced at the beginning of this year that forty-four companies held over 72 per cent of the total contracts. The House Tolan Committee (investigating defense migration) stated in its second interim report, December 19, 1941:

"The system of contract awards in effect excludes from production the facilities of tens of thousands of small producers. . . . It is inconceivable that war can be waged successfully without such full utilization of our resources."

Most of the Knudsen group, which came to Washington to serve as executives, "without compensation," did not, it became increasingly evident, automatically lose the outlook of big business by being transferred from industry to government. How could they insist that the biggest plants be converted to war production when those enterprises were mainly concerned with protecting the value of their plants for the future and preserving "good-will" built up over many years by continuing to produce sufficient quantities of their products to maintain leadership in industry? In many cases they refused flatly to switch existing plants and machinery to the manufacture of war materials.

In fact, they made clear that they only wanted further contracts on their own terms, whereby the government would construct for their use new plants at public expense. These new plants they expected ultimately to produce the required armaments without need of subcontracting. A handful at the very top could in this way have preserved a monopoly over peacetime production while extending this monopoly to the armament industry. Yet they knew that supplies of strategic materials—aluminum, cop-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

per, steel, zinc, lead, rubber, tin, and almost all other raw materials —were insufficient to provide for both the flow of peacetime products and the war needs. They did not face this fact, and instead of increasing the supplies of strategic materials, went so far as to resist expansion, restricting the flow in anticipation of higher prices, and in the attempt to force out small competitors.

As an example, the copper companies refused to increase their mining of this important metal unless and until the government permitted sweeping advances in prices. The report of the House Naval Affairs Committee, headed by Carl Vinson, made public on January 20, 1942, showed that profits of the largest corporations were swollen; a few of them had realized as much as 20 to 75 per cent on government orders—and at taxpayers' expense. Bethlehem Steel in one instance (it refused to reveal profits on its major operations) netted over 20 per cent on a $19,000,000 order. General Motors made a similar average on its contracts, and the Aluminum Company of America registered 129 per cent profit on one contract, more than 50 per cent on many others. C. E. Wilson told the Tolan Committee: "The defense program is big business. We might all just make up our minds to that."

It is necessary to deal sharply with the business-as-usual forces in order to get war production under way. Conversion must be speeded; also the smaller plants must be drawn into the war effort by spreading master contracts and letting out sub-contracts in the widest possible manner. Allen Taub, O.P.M. technical expert, frequently called for such an "explosion" method, pointing out that "You can't design in a lump. You have to design in detail." As plans for tanks or planes or any other war machine are drawn up, there is no insurmountable difficulty in placing orders for units. Factories of limited capacity, unable to build the entire machine, but completely competent to build parts of it, can be drawn into production. This method has finally been adopted in England. And it has the particular advantage of bringing ever wider distribution of contracts, engaging more and more of the nation's industrial capacity.

There is need for more and better planning, and more authoritative coordination between O.P.M. and the Army and Navy procurement agencies. Obviously the President and the Administration forces generally are taking steps to remedy this situation, to institute planning and close collaboration of all groups involved in war production.

The further top centralization of the government's war production machinery, with Donald M. Nelson at the head, is calculated to improve administration and speed up production. But the success of this latest reorganization will hinge largely upon the determination with which the new War Production Board and Mr. Nelson will work to put an end to all "business-as-usual" practices. It will hinge upon the energy with which the government will pursue the aim of establishing close and harmonious rela-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions between management, labor and government, and in drawing labor more actively and fully into the government and war production agencies. An important step in this direction has been taken by the government in conjunction with the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. in establishing the Labor Victory Board.

Meanwhile certain developments are taking place in various industries and localities—down below, so to speak—which are of great promise to the success of our war production program. Unfortunately the general press has been devoting all too little attention to this vital matter. We refer particularly to the growth of joint plant committees of labor and management, production conferences of shop stewards, local production conferences of labor, management, and government, and united actions of labor organizations (C.I.O., A. F. of L., Railroad Brotherhoods) to promote national defense and war production. The *Daily Worker* and the *Sunday Worker*, reporting and popularizing these developments, have thus rendered an inestimable service to the nation's war effort.

Most outstanding are the activities of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union of the C.I.O. These are resulting in the establishment of collaboration between management and labor in various plants—joint management-union councils. Enough experience has already been accumulated to prove the great value of these councils for increasing war production, this being the opinion of labor and management alike. Here, therefore, is a proven way of hastening war production from below, in plants and localities. But these are only beginnings. While the trade unions in most places are offering management such collaboration, taking the initiative for it, and while technical production management in many instances views with favor such proposals, many of the "top people" of the large corporations still stand in the way or sit on their managerial "prerogatives," while valuable time is being lost. And time is the one thing we cannot afford to lose. As the President said: lost territory can be regained, lost time—never.

From this, certain conclusions have to be drawn. The largest single factor that stands today between the American people and maximum war production are the attitudes of "business-as-usual" and the obstructionist policies of certain monopolies who are associated with or influenced by pro-fascist appeaser elements. This is a fact. The American people are willing to pay for the war effort. American labor has shown itself ready to do everything for it. It has the capabilities, the enthusiasm and the determination. It has also shown initiative and has produced valuable plans and suggestions. Furthermore, labor is acting unitedly in most localities and industries. And on a national scale, the Labor Victory Board can give expression to this growing unity of action. Labor and technical production management in plants—when unhampered by influences of "business as usual"—have shown a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remarkable ability to join efforts for speeding war production.

The conclusion is obvious: combat and overcome "skepticism" and "business as usual" practices which are fostered by certain monopolists; give labor adequate representation in the government and in the direction of the national production effort; obtain the pooling of industrial facilities, spread contracts, insist on widely distributed subcontracts, speed conversion wherever possible. In the end, this rests upon the further strengthening of labor and national unity, especially upon labor's united action and cooperation with the Administration, to convince the country that, without these steps, victory is menaced.

Nor can morale be neglected; and morale depends, among other things, on the granting of unemployment insurance to those out of work because of the shifting economy, on retraining of idle workers for the job ahead. Still further, labor, through production committees in every plant, no matter how small, can cooperate with management to bring unused equipment into the war effort, to arrange for conversion, to show the War Production Board how the facilities of the smaller plants can be utilized and their capacity mobilized.

This is one of the most important immediate war tasks of the United States. *It is the task of converting our industries into a single unit for war production, in the shortest possible time.* This is what the government calls for, as the President declared in his Message to Congress:

"We must strain every armament-producing facility to the utmost. We must convert every available plant and tool to war production. That goes all the way from the greatest plants to the smallest—from the huge automobile industry to the village machine shop."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOVIET-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP: THE CONTRIBUTION OF "MISSION TO MOSCOW"

BY WILLIAM LINDSAY

I.

VICTORY in the present world-wide liberation war against the fascist coalition will depend on the collective strength and effective solidarity of the United Nations. Of crucial importance, within the framework of the anti-Hitler coalition, is Soviet-American friendship. The degree to which mutual understanding and unity of action can be achieved on the part of these two strongest of the anti-Axis powers will have a decisive bearing on the course of the struggle and on the shaping of the peace. In stating this truth, we reaffirm, in the critical conditions of war, what was true also in the days which led up to the war: that relations between the United States and the Soviet Union are a primary, determining factor in world politics. Today those relations are a key to victory over the barbarian menace of Hitlerite tyranny, its Japanese ally and its European vassals.

A number of years ago Earl Browder stated clearly and emphatically that Soviet-American collaboration was vital both to American security and to the safety of world civilization. He declared:

"The main idea which I am defending in the field of foreign policy is that of ever closer collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union, as the major factor in the organization of world peace, as the chief protection of the world against the flood of fascist barbarism, for the maintenance of an ordered civilization in a large part of the world."*

And he asserted his confident belief that "the United States will ultimately, despite all obstacles and prejudices, find itself in cooperation with the Soviet Union to salvage peace and civilization." How strikingly has history vindicated that belief!

Collaboration between our country and the U.S.S.R. rests today on the firm basis of common defense of the national independence of each, against a common foe. The cornerstone of collaboration now is the supreme urgency of defeating once and forever the deadly threat of fascist world enslavement, of destroying fascism.

One of the greatest obstacles to friendly collaboration has been the towering wall of anti-Soviet lies

* *The Second Imperialist War*, International Publishers, 1940, p. 56.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and prejudices painstakingly and implacably erected by the pro-fascist forces in this country, in pursuit of their studied policy of obstruction of collective and national security alike. This barrage of slanderous misrepresentation of the realities of Soviet life has done immense harm to our nation's welfare. It was the heart and core of the policy of appeasement and did much to block our country's adoption of an effective foreign policy which would safeguard our national interests by concerted action with the Soviet Union and the other democratic states for stopping the fascist warmakers. It has in great part deprived our people of the close collaboration of a powerful friend and ally, and of the benefit of an objective comprehension of the rich experiences and lessons of the strivings and achievements of the land of socialist democracy.

In the mighty crucible of war, however, not a few solid truths are emerging from the slag of ignorance and falsehood. The anti-Soviet slanders begin to crumble in the white heat of living experience. Millions of people are stirred by the epic of Soviet resistance to Hitler's blitzkrieg, and their hopes are fired by the crushing counter-offensive before Moscow, on the Northern Front, in the Ukraine. Admiration and heartfelt appreciation of these heroic contributions to our common cause mingle with growing recognition of certain truths: Soviet strength and unity and wise leadership, as opposed to the exploding myths of Soviet "weakness" and "incompetence" and "inner conflict." The learning of the truth about the Soviet Union, vital to our country's safety and future progress, is taking place the hard way, in the difficult days of war. Whoever impedes that process, prolonging the sway of prejudice and distrust, puts obstacles in the path of victory. Whoever speeds the process, hastening the growth of understanding and cooperation, strengthens the anti-Axis front, brings victory nearer.

In addition to day-to-day experience there are individual testimonies that help create understanding. Such is the recently-published *Mission to Moscow,** by ex-Ambassador Joseph E. Davies.

This book, which deservedly has become the first best-seller of 1942, is an outstanding expression of the new, encouraging development that is taking place in American-Soviet relations. Written by a distinguished lawyer and businessman who was American Ambassador to Moscow in the critical years 1936-38, it contains many of his official reports to the President and the State Department, together with letters and excerpts from his private diary and journal. The fact that the State Department has seen fit to release such official papers for publication at this time is significant, and indicative of the improvement in relations between the two countries. The mass sales and library demand for the book bear eloquent witness to the widespread, newly awakened and intense interest in the Soviet Union that is felt today by vast and ever increasing numbers of Americans.

* Joseph E. Davies, *Mission to Moscow*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1941, 659 pp., $3.00.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In its turn, the book itself is making a valuable and positive contribution to the strengthening of the mutual friendship of the American and Soviet peoples.

It is doing so by helping to dispel prejudices and misconceptions about the actual character and role of the Soviet Union.

In his Foreword, the author states the main purpose which he set himself in compiling the book:

"In our country there has been and is much violence of opinion, some prejudice, and much more misinformation about Russia and the Soviet Union. Without being partisan or argumentative, I hope that the material contained in this book will give a factual basis and possibly a more accurate concept of the Soviet Government, its leaders and its people." (p. xv.)

This was the spirit, also, in which Mr. Davies had undertaken his assignment at the Moscow embassy: a spirit startlingly rare in a diplomat accredited to that capital, and one which the leaders of the Soviet Union recognized and appreciated.

"When I went to Russia, I made up my mind that I was going to go there free from prejudice and with an open mind. . . . There was always present a deliberate effort to be fair, judicial, and objective-minded. When I left Russia, President Kalinin said to me, in effect, 'We are sorry you are leaving. While you are not in accord with our belief and our political ideology, we believe you to have been honest in your appraisal and honest in your effort to see what was being done. The worst that you have had to say you have said to us, and the best that you have had to say you have said to our enemies.'" (pp. xvii-xviii.)

As a result of this honest, objective approach, Mr. Davies came to recognize certain primary truths regarding the Soviet Union: its devoted and tireless pursuit of social and economic betterment for its people; its consistent struggle for collective security before the war; its great industrial, military and political strength; its timely uprooting of the fifth column within its borders; its international significance as a power on the side of progress.

On the basis of his recognition of these facts, Davies takes his stand squarely and unequivocally in favor of increasing the friendly collaboration between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union, in favor of a policy that will effect this object, in the national interests of our own country.

In a confidential dispatch to the Secretary of State, dated Brussels, January 17, 1939, the former ambassador writes:

"In my judgment, so long as the policy of the United States is to maintain relations with the Soviet Union, it is desirable that these relations should be of a friendly character. The manpower, resources, and the strength of both the Soviet Government and the Soviet people, their military and naval defenses, and their present economic and moral purpose of preserving peace constitute a factor which may be of great value in the maintenance of law and order and a moral concept

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as between nations, particularly in view of the aggressive disposition now apparent in the combined authoritarian states." (p. 545.)

On an earlier occasion, dealing with the application of such a policy in the conduct of the embassy's work, Davies had written:

"On the assumption that the United States decides to maintain displomatic relations here, it is, in my opinion, advisable that the conduct of this mission should be projected and maintained in as friendly and harmonious a spirit as is possible, consistent with the strict adherence to the performance of all obligations under the agreements between the two countries. . . .

"Such a policy does not involve approving in any manner the ideological concepts of this government. It does, however, recognize the right of self-determination. It is interpretative of the high-minded and Christian-like declarations of the foreign policy of the United States as expressed by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State in connection with foreign affairs. It is a 'Good Neighbor Policy,' and one consistent with the best traditions of our diplomatic history." (pp. 424-5.)

II.

The period covered by Davies' mission (1936-38) was characterized above all else by the imminence of the war danger. The ambassador paid tribute on numerous occasions to both the Soviet Government's sincere striving for peace, and its profound foresight and fully realistic appraisal of the factors involved in the critical international situation of the time.

"From my observation and contacts since 1936, I believe that outside of the President of the United States alone no government in the world saw more clearly the menace of Hitler to peace and the necessity for collective security and alliances among non-aggressive nations than did the Soviet Government." (p. 495.)

Davies realized clearly that the only hope for European peace lay in a firm British-French-Soviet alliance with the cooperation of the United States; and that failure to conclude such a pact on the part of the Western powers could lead only to catastrophe. He observed the sinister workings of the policy of appeasement, and wrote to Sumner Welles, in March, 1938, six months before Munich:

"For some reason, or lack of reason, there seems to be no purpose on the part of the democracies of Europe to fortify their position realistically by availing themselves of such strength as there is here as part of their common front. . . . England and France seem to be doing exactly the opposite here and have been playing into the hands of the Nazi and the fascist aims. The Soviet Union is rapidly being driven into a complete isolation and even hostility to England and indifference to France." (p. 297.)

When appeasement had made war inevitable and the U.S.S.R. signed the non-aggression pact with Germany, Davies sent to the State Department his estimate of the significance of the Soviet policy:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

". . . the development of this non-aggression pact between Russia and Germany to me was not unexpected. My reports from Moscow have pointed out for two years past that it was perfectly clear that if Europe were to make 'peace,' it would have to be a 'fascist peace,' imposed by the dictators, unless England and France created a countervailing east and west axis, by the inclusion of the Soviets, and established a 'balance of power' which would keep peace through an equilibrium of forces." (pp. 453-4.)

Then, in a letter to Secretary Hull, on October 12, 1939:

"I am disposed to the opinion that the Russian policy may be exactly what she proclaims it to be; namely, a desire to establish peace in Europe if she can, and particularly on her eastern border, and in addition thereto to develop her own resources secure from attack of the capitalistic western nations. To effect this security, naturally, the Soviets would desire to have their western line shoved as far west from Moscow and the Don basin as possible, as a protection against a possible enemy Germany. It is also vital to her strategic defense and economic and national development that her access to the sea shall be protected by open-water sea bases the year round, and hence her attitude toward the Baltic countries. . . .

". . . Thus Hitler closed his eastern door, but he paid a very high price." (pp. 465-6.)

Later, in a letter to Harry Hopkins, Davies stated:

"The Soviets became convinced, and with considerable reason, that no effective, direct and practical, general arrangement could be made with France and Britain. They were driven to a pact of non-aggression with Hitler. . . .

"No government saw more clearly or stated with greater accuracy what Hitler was doing and would do and what ought to be done to preserve peace and to prevent the projection of a war by Hitler than did the Soviets." (p. 496.)

The understanding which Davies had acquired of the country's military, industrial and political strength enabled him to gauge correctly the power of resistance which the Soviet Union would oppose to the German invaders, when the treacherous blow of June 22 was struck. Surprise or incredulity was the usual reaction, in most official and business circles, to his estimates of Soviet strength.

The stand which Davies took at the time of Hitler's attack, a stand which he has reiterated forcefully before vast audiences in both the United States and Canada, in the course of his active support to the cause of full aid to the Soviet Union, is summed up in his reply to a press correspondent on June 22:

"I told him that in my opinion, the extent of the resistance of the Red Army would amaze and surprise the world; and even though Hitler were to take a substantial part of the Ukraine, his troubles would then just begin. . . . It was just plain common sense to give the Soviets all the aid we possibly could, because they were fighting the greatest danger to our security in the world, the menace of Hitler's aggression and lust for world dom-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ination. This statement was rather widely carried by the press, as it was directly contrary to practically all of the opinions of the best military experts. It was, however, founded not upon hearsay, so far as I was concerned. It was based upon what I myself had seen in Russia." (pp. 475-6.)

* * *

No aspect of the Soviet Union's stringent measures of self-protection and defense, taken in the face of impending war, has been so shamelessly misrepresented as its thoroughgoing uprooting of the fascist fifth column, its ruthless extirpating of the Nazi-Trotskyite spy-nests. The lessons of Norway and France have served to throw considerable light on what is involved in the fascist technique of "internal aggression." Davies correctly sees the stern suppression of the anti-Soviet Quislings in the U.S.S.R. as an integral part of a policy of vigilant defense against the Hitlerite Axis. His position as U.S. Ambassador, combined with his experience as a lawyer, enables him to speak with some authority. He declares:

"The story which was unfolded in these trials disclosed a record of fifth columnist and subversive activities in Russia under a conspiracy agreement with the German and Japanese Governments that were amazing." (p. 276.)

Regarding the guilt of the defendants (he had attended both the Radek-Piatakov and Bukharin trials), Davies states emphatically that

". . . after daily observation of the witnesses, their manner of testifying, the unconscious corroboration which developed, and other facts in the course of the trial, together with others of which a judicial notice could be taken, it is my opinion so far as the political defendants are concerned sufficient crimes under Soviet law, among those charged in the indictment, were established by the proof and beyond a reasonable doubt to justify the verdict of guilty of treason and the adjudication of the punishment provided by Soviet criminal statutes." (p. 272.)

An interesting sidelight on the major complicity of Berlin in the Trotskyite treason activities is provided by a note in Davies' diary, January 16, 1937. While on his way to Moscow, he visited the German foreign office and had an extended interview with the head of its "Russian Division":

"To my surprise he stated that my views as to the stability of internal Russian political conditions and the security of the Stalin regime would bear investigation. My information, he thought, was all wrong—Stalin was not firmly entrenched. He stated that I probably would find that there was much revolutionary activity there, which might shortly break out into the open." (p. 10.)

The treason "broke into the open" through being pulled up by the roots: the Radek-Piatakov trial opened only a week after this significant interview.

Viewing the whole question of the trials in the light of experiences of the war, Davies comes to the following general conclusion:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"All of these trials, purges, and liquidations, which seemed so violent at the time and shocked the world, are now quite clearly a part of a vigorous and determined effort of the Stalin Government to protect itself from not only revolution from within but from attack from without. They went to work thoroughly to clean up and to clean out all treasonable elements within the country. . . .

"There were no fifth columnists in Russia in 1941—they had shot them. The purge had cleansed the country and rid it of treason." (p. 280.)

This estimation of the role of the trials is a far cry from the venomous hysteria of the anti-Soviet propagandists, ranging from the pro-fascist monopolists to the vacillating liberals and the traitor "Socialists" of the *New Leader* and Norman Thomas camps. with their Lindbergh-myth of a "hopelessly weakened Red Army," etc. The timely intervention of Soviet justice was ultimately to be vindicated before the whole world, by life itself. Yet had Americans come to learn the truth of the matter sooner, the pro-fascist appeasers would have had less success with their political wrecking and sabotage work, and our country would have found its way more speedily to the indispensable, secure alignment at the side of the U.S.S.R.

III.

From the outset of his stay the ambassador undertook a careful, systematic survey of the industrial, agricultural, social and cultural enterprises of a number of different regions: an endeavor which once prompted Litvinov to remark that Davies at the end of three months "had acquired more information and knowledge of Russia . . . than any other ambassador had obtained in two years." (p. 110.)

The chief impressions which Davies derived of the work of socialist construction were those of its immensity, its breathtaking tempo, and the youth and enthusiasm of so many of its youthful executants.

He speaks of the great public works and industrial plants as being "projected on a 'ten-league canvas with the brush of comet's hair'" (p. 406), and reports to the State Department:

"Enormous and even astounding strides have been made in industrial and scientific development and achievement within the past eight years. . . . Nothing . . . can stop the continued exploitation of this country's enormous resources and wealth. The ambitions of the country youth have been fired. Educational facilities have been afforded. Education, scientific or otherwise, is being extensively projected and made universal. Caste or class barriers to individual advancement have been broken down. . . .

"The next generation, in my opinion, will see these people here exercising a tremendous influence not only upon European but upon world conditions." (pp. 308-10.)

Speaking at a function held shortly before his departure from the Soviet Union, Davies observed:

"I have had the opportunity to see for myself these great industrial enterprises that have sprung up within the past ten years. In my

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion, the extent of that economic development during that short period has been unparalleled.

"What has particularly impressed me in that connection is the youth and enthusiasm of the young men and women who have been recruited from the collective farms, given the opportunity to technical and scientific education, and are now administering these great plants." (p. 367.)

Davies comments, in a letter of June, 1938, on the "improvement we have seen in the streets—more well-dressed people, more shoes, more color, more handsome automobiles, etc."—and states his opinion that the growth in consumers' goods is "remarkable," considering that at least 80 per cent of the manufacturing plant had sprung practically "from the heel of Jove" in the preceding decade. (p. 363). On another occasion he expresses his wonder at the fact that at a time of extraordinary increase in military expenditure, the outlay for social and cultural purposes "kept pace and exceeded it." (p. 398.)

The hatred and fear felt by pro-fascist reaction at the spectacle of socialist successes in the Soviet Union have found vent above all in slanderous denunciations of Stalin, the initiator and architest of those successes. It is therefore a service to democracy that the author of *Mission to Moscow* performs when he refutes the slanderers, in his account of the interview with Stalin. In the course of this account, he observes:

"His manner is kindly, his manner almost deprecatingly simple, his personality and expression of reserve strength and poise very marked. . . ."

"He gives the impression of a strong mind which is composed and wise. . . . He has a sly humor. He has a very great mentality. It is sharp, shrewd, and, above all things, wise, at least so it would appear to me. If you can picture a personality that is exactly opposite to what the most rabid anti-Stalinist anywhere could conceive, then you might picture this man." (pp. 343, 356-7.)

More than once, Davies refers to Stalin's role in the extension of democratic rights—as in the adoption of the 1937 Constitution—and the safeguarding of religious liberty. The profoundly progressive character of the social edifice which was arising under Stalin's leadership is moreover thrown into relief by the running fire of comments which appear in Davies' diary with regard to the regime of terror and religious persecutions raging in *Hitler Germany*. The Nazi tyranny is utterly irreconcilable with the principles of altruism and Christian charity to which Davies adheres. On the other hand, the Soviet Union, as he is quick to recognize despite theoretical points of disagreement, is inspired by an advanced humanism:

"In my opinion, the Russian people, the Soviet Government, and the Soviet leaders are moved, basically, by altruistic concepts. It is their purpose to promote the brotherhood of man and to improve the lot of the common people. They wish to create a society in which men may live as equals, governed by ethical ideals. They are devoted to peace.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They have made great sacrifices attempting to achieve those spiritual aspirations. They are fighting our fight now against Hitlerism and should receive every possible help as speedily and with as much friendly cooperation as we can extend." (p. 511.)

Mr. Davies, understandably, sees the Soviet Union through the eyes of a liberal businessman. He goes in search of facts, and that he discovers a goodly number of them is evident from the foregoing. But the underlying politico-economic relationships, it must be said, escape him to a considerable degree. Hence theoretical points of disagreement, which, though very definitely secondary in importance as compared with his recognition of the major political truths discussed above, nonetheless need to be pointed out.

Thus, the author of *Mission to Moscow* states his belief that "Communism, as such, cannot work on this earth, with human nature as it is." (p. xvi.) However, finding that human nature is in full and lusty operation in the Soviet Union, he must needs conclude that this system is "something else"—"a system of state socialism operating on capitalistic principles and steadily and irresistibly swinging to the right." (p. 511.) He claims that "the regime dropped the principle of communism in its practical application" (p. 391); that "the theoretical Communists . . . were compelled to resort to the elementals of human nature, to wit: self-interest and profit for labor" (p. 123).

Davies sees in the existence of individual initiative, and of incentives to its development in the form of wage differences and bonuses, a "departure from Marxist principle." The tremendous economic and social advances which he observes with ungrudging admiration are due, in his opinion, not to the struggle to build socialism, but to some other factor, compounded of natural wealth and "human nature." All of this arises from unclarity regarding the nature of socialism, a failure to see clearly the meaning and implications of the socialist ownership of the means of production in the Soviet Union.

The confusion arises from an unreal and abstract conception of communism as a "selfless society" (p. xvi); a lack of understanding of the actual character of socialism and communism as distinct historic phases of social development; an unscientific definition of *classes* as "after all, only a word to describe an idea; the basis of which is that there are different groups of men which are differentiated, as among themselves." (p. 123.) In the absence of a clear definition of classes as groups standing in a definite relationship to the *ownership of the means of production,* the character of socialism is blurred, incompletely grasped; and "incentives to labor" (under socialism) and "the profit motive" (of capitalism) can be interchanged at will, and made meaningless.

Socialism, it must be observed, does not consist in a universal leveling-out of individuality and initiative, nor in the establishment of an equalitarian absence of luxuries and comforts. It consists in the own-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ership by society of the means of production, which, far from suppressing, unleashes the fullest flourishing of individual and collective initiative and enrichment, with a constantly rising standard of living. The "Marxist principles" from which a "departure" is alleged differ from Mr. Davies' conception of them. Marxism distinguishes between socialism and communism as successive historic stages in mankind's advance, following on the abolition of capitalism. Of the first, or socialist, stage, Marx wrote:

"But one man will excel another physically or intellectually and so contributes in the same time more labor, or can labor for a longer time; and labor, to serve as a measure, must be defined by its duration or intensity, otherwise it ceases to be a standard measure. This *equal* right . . . recognizes no class differences because every worker ranks as a worker like his fellows, but it tacitly recognizes unequal individual endowment, and thus capacities for production, as natural privileges. . . .

"In a higher phase of Communist society . . . after the powers of production have also increased and all the springs of cooperative wealth are gushing more freely together with the all-round development of the individual, then and then only can the narrow bourgeois horizon of rights be left far behind and society will inscribe on its banner: 'From each according to his capacity, to each according to his need.'" (Karl Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, International Publishers, pp. 30-31.)

Thus, too, Stalin, in his interview with Emil Ludwig, in 1932, stated:

"The kind of socialism under which everybody would receive the same pay, an equal quantity of bread, would wear the same kind of clothes and would receive the same kind of goods and in equal quantities—such a kind of socialism is unknown to Marxism. All that Marxism declares is that until classes have been completely abolished, and until work has been transformed from being a means of maintaining existence, into a prime necessity of life, into voluntary labor performed for the benefit of society, people will continue to be paid for their labor in accordance with the amount of labor performed. 'From each according to his capacity, to each according to the work he performs,' such is the Marxian formula of socialism, *i.e.*, the first stage of communism, the first stage of a communist society. Only in the highest phase of communism will people, working in accordance with their capacity, receive recompense in accordance with their needs: 'From each according to his capacity, to each according to his needs.'" (Joseph Stalin, *An Interview with Emil Ludwig*, Moscow, 1932, pp 15-16.)

It is in the light of these Marxist principles that the socialist society of the Soviet Union can be understood.

On the question of the socialist state Davies falls into a similar confusion as with the case of the socialist economy. He states: "The government is a dictatorship not 'of the proletariat,' as professed, but 'over the proletariat.' It is completely dominated by one man." (p. 403.) Yet he himself, when dealing in the realm of simple facts, cites numer-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ous evidences of flourishing democracy, such as fully controvert this hasty repetition of a *cliché* of the bourgeois and Social-Democratic press. He describes the constitutional convention of the R.S.F.S.R., where the Stalin Constitution is adopted by the Russian Soviet delegates from factory and office and collective farm; he discusses the extension of equal suffrage to the whole working population of both sexes; and quotes specifically the guarantees, in the Stalin Constitution, of religious freedom and national equality. And of the role of Stalin's leadership, he declares:

"The strength of the present regime is found in the resolute, bold, and able leadership of Stalin." (p. 417.)

What escapes him—and it is precisely that which would have enabled him to see the proletarian dictatorship in its true light, as a democracy of a new, higher type—is the fact that this "resolute, bold and able leadership," on the part of Stalin, the Bolshevik party and the government of the socialist state, has generated in the whole people the greatest *confidence* and *trust*. And this confidence has been repeatedly vindicated by events, which have borne out the soundness of the Stalinist policies: nowhere can this be seen more clearly than in the present war against the Hitlerite invaders. As a result of the relationship of mutual trust existing between leaders and people, the Soviet country has become more powerfully united than ever; and the "miracles" of morale and mass heroism and titanic unified effort have stemmed precisely from the richly democratic texture of Soviet life, founded on the common ownership of the nation's productive wealth.

The same kind of unclarity is evident in the "parallel" that is drawn between Germany and the Soviet Union. Certainly, Davies recognizes something of the profound difference between the Nazi State and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics when he counterposes the one to the other, saying that whereas Nazism is utterly incompatible with the principles of altruism and Christian brotherhood, on the other hand, as he puts it, "the communistic Soviet state could function with the Christian religion in its basic purpose to serve the brotherhood of man" (p. 487). Actually, Davies' whole book provides ample demonstration of the socially progressive, peace-loving and constructive rorle of the Soviet Union, as opposed to the unspeakable Nazi reaction, barbarism, vandalism and tyranny.

Yet the author allows himself to slip into "generalizations" about Germany and the Soviet Union such as this:

"Both . . . are totalitarian states. Both are realistic. Both are strong and ruthless in their methods." (p. 486.)

Such a "generalization" can only arise from an unthinking, blithe ignoring of the whole question of what *classes* hold power in each of the two countries; from overlooking this "detail," that in Germany power

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is in the hands of the most ferociously reactionary and rapacious crew of imperialist millionaire-industrialists, who are bent on a policy of rapine, pillage and enslavement of the earth; while in the Soviet Union power is in the hands of the working people, the builders of the most advanced and progressive society known to history, who are unbreakably united in an epic struggle to defend alike their socialist land and our common cause of independence and democratic liberty. To fall into facile talk of "totalitarian states" in general is to belie the main point of the book. Such a formulation can only impair the effectiveness of Davies' message, in which he honestly and admiringly records many of the Soviet people's achievements, and concludes as to the need for fullest friendly cooperation with them in their valiant struggle to smash utterly the Nazi monster.

But theoretical unclarity has not prevented Davies from producing a book that is in essence an act of friendship, a genuine contribution to international democratic unity. That is the important thing about *Mission to Moscow* and about its author.

IV.

Today, more than ever before, the attitudes of people toward the Soviet Union and friendly cooperation between it and our own country are a touchstone of their honesty, progressivism and patriotism. As a contribution to mutual understanding and collaboration against the Axis, Davies' book has been widely acclaimed by honest foes of Hitler. It has been the object of venomous attack by enemies of anti-Hitler unity and of America's security. The most open and characteristic attack has been that of Professor John Dewey, published as a letter to the *New York Times* of January 11, 1942.

In his endeavor to throw discredit on Davies' honesty and intelligence, and to engender a maximum of anti-Soviet sentiment, Mr. Dewey overreaches himself. By slanderously comparing the anti-Soviet wreckers and degenerate assassins with Washington, Jefferson, Adams and other American Revolutionary heroes, and Joseph Stalin with the traitor Aaron Burr; by proclaiming that it was not Hitler, but Stalin who was responsible for the outbreak of the European war in 1939; by urging that American-Soviet cooperation be kept to a minimum, and raising the Goebbels lie of imminent Soviet defection from the United Nations camp—Mr. Dewey advertises his adherence to the camp of Hitlerism. Long sipping at the poisoned wells of Trotskyism has made this sanctimonious "seeker after truth" a veritable fountainhead of falsehood. "I do not know whether or not there were fifth columnists in Russia," this Trotsky's advocate intones, eyes heavenward. This academic echo of the Wilhelmstrasse "does not know" either, apparently, that America is at war with Hitler, and that the Soviet Union is our ally. For him, honest American admiration of Soviet heroism is a "fatuous one-sided love-fest," for which he

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would substitute a "circumspection" that ill conceals the word he means: "hostility." Split anti-Hitler unity—sabotage the common war front—sell out America!—such is the intent behind the professorial-pragmatist "critique." A reminder to vigilant Americans that the place to look for traitors is labeled not only "America First" but "Nazi-Trotskyites." Their squeaking is not unlike that of Professor Dewey's pen.

* * *

American patriots, fighting for victory in the most perilous and implacable struggle in which our country ever has engaged, will understand that the vanquishing of the enemy demands that our friendship and energetic collaboration with the heroic Soviet fighters be strengthened to the uttermost.

We have to do here not simply with a matter of passing contingency or expediency, but with the whole future destiny of our country. The ways in which history has linked the paths of our United States and of the great socialist Soviet Union have been described in these effective terms by Earl Browder:

"The United States, although the land of the highest developed capitalism, has many affinities with the Soviet Union, the land of socialism where Lenin's ideas have entirely triumphed. The two countries are similar in their broad expanse of territory, in the problems of the conquest of nature, of harnessing the enormous natural resources for the benefit of their peoples. This created many common national characteristics which, even before the destruction of the tsarist autocracy, had brought about a friendly attitude of the two peoples toward each other, an intense interest in one another between the American and Russian peoples, a feeling of kinship that surmounted all barriers.

"Since the rise of the new socialist government out of the ruins of the old tsarist Russian Empire, since the Soviet Union has transformed that formerly backward land into the economically most advanced country in the world, with the single exception of the United States, the affinities, the common interests, the sympathies between the peoples of the two countries have grown by leaps and bounds. And the political development of the world, with the rise of the Berlin-Rome-Tokio war alliance of fascism which threatens the destruction of all civilization, predetermines with the inexorability of natural law an historic collaboration. Both are threatened by the same enemies, both have a national interest in peace and orderly relations between nations. It is clear that neither can fully realize its own destiny without the friendly collaboration of the other.

"It required the genius, the deep insight into the laws of history, of Lenin, to foresee this development many years ago. But today the world situation makes it clear that the Communists are no longer alone in recognizing that history itself has prepared and demands the collaboration of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. as the price of saving the world from catastrophe. The most farsighted and advanced representatives of all classes in America recognize this fact and move, even if

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hesitantly as yet, towards its realization." (Address delivered at Philadelphia, January 20, 1939; in *Fighting for Peace*, by Earl Browder, International Publishers, 1939.)

To re-read these words is to be stirred to patriotic protest that this wise and consistent defender of a sound and democratic policy for America's national and social security should be allowed to remain behind prison bars in this time of decisive struggle against fascism.

The guarantee of the independence, liberty and progress of these United States, of the safety of ourselves and of our children, is to be found in the growing solidarity of the allies joined together by the United Nations compact. Of this solidarity, Soviet-American friendship and collaboration are the veritable keystone. This is recognized by millions of patriotic Americans who are striving to extend existing American-Soviet collaboration with a full-fledged military and political alliance between our two great countries and to develop still closer ties and joint action between the United Nations as a whole. For this is vital for the national security of our country, for ensuring the most rapid destruction of Hitler and Hitlerism and for establishing a just peace.

By contributing to that firm collaboration, ex-Ambassador Davies has deserved well of his countrymen.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW "INTERNATIONAL" PAMPHLETS

Thaddeus Stevens, by Elizabeth Lawson . . . . . **$.10**

The great Abolitionist as one of the most advanced democrats of his era.

Harriet Tubman: Negro Soldier and Abolitionist, by Earl Conrad . . . . . **.15**

A study of the outstanding Negro woman leader who joined the Union army.

William Sylvis and the National Labor Union, by Charlotte Todes . . . . . **.25**

The first national organization of American labor, and its leader, in a new study.

Thomas Paine: Selections from his Writings . . . . . **.25**

A new edition with an introduction by James S. Allen.

Work Under Capitalism and Socialism, by A. Leontyev . **.15**

The nature and character of labor under two economic systems.

Japanese Imperialism Exposed: The Secret Tanaka Document **.10**

Japan's program of imperialist expansion and conquest.

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To America at War

NEWS FROM THE FIGHTING FRONTS

Exclusive news from Manila and Moscow . . . from London and Libya . . . from the Fighting Fronts . . . News from the occupied countries . . . News of our armed forces in action . . . Military analysis by "A Veteran Commander" . . . Complete coverage of American labor activities . . . First-hand accounts of America's "Battle for Production" . . . An unexcelled Washington Bureau . . .

These are a few reasons why

THE DAILY AND SUNDAY WORKER READER IS BETTER INFORMED THAN THE READER OF ANY OTHER NEWSPAPER IN THE UNITED STATES!

●

DAILY AND SUNDAY WORKER

50 East 13th Street, New York, N. Y.

5¢ ——— At Your Newsstand ——— 5¢

●

Write for free sample copy and subscription rates

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED